

D. Murphy

VOLUME XV.

[JANUARY.]

NUMBER 9.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY;

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION,

AS NEW FORTH IS THE

Formularies of the Westminster Divines,

AND WITHIN THE FOLD BY THE

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

REV. JAMES MARTIN KENNER AND PROPRIETOR.

Then with the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where
is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. Jan. 1. 18.

ALBANY.

PRINTED BY HOFFMAN & WHITE.

CHICAGO

1858-9

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

JANUARY, 1839.

ART. I. *Historical Sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians.*

(Concluded from page 294.)

During the last session of this convention, a large company of Brethren arrived in Philadelphia, and were cordially welcomed by the convention. A gentleman offered to sell them a piece of land in the Forks of Delaware; this offer they accepted, and began to build a regular settlement, which was afterwards called BETHLEHEM. Thither the newly arrived Colony went in June, 1742, and, with those already settled there, composed a congregation of one hundred and twenty persons.

The original design in building Bethlehem, was, that it should be placed on the same footing with the Missionary congregation in Europe, and that its members should consider it their peculiar calling to diffuse the knowledge of the gospel throughout the whole of North America, wherever a door of utterance should be opened to them. To facilitate this, the inhabitants agreed to institute a community of goods, to regulate their house-keeping in the most frugal manner, and apply the surplus of their gains to the education of children, the support of ministers and school-masters in the country, who received no regular salary, and the establishment of missions among the Indians. This regulation continued for several years, but, as might be expected, was found untenable, when the settlement increased in the number and diversity of character of its inhabitants.

The building of Nazareth, which is nine miles North of Bethlehem, was somewhat retarded in consequence of the hostility of the Indian occupiers of the land, who resisted the order of their great national council to quit it. The Brethren, not wishing to irritate these savages, whose instruction in Christianity was a principal object of their settling in the country, purchased the produce of their fields at their own price, after the Indians relinquished their claims to hold possession, and offered peaceably to remove. After this, Nazareth, as well as Bethlehem, rapidly increased in external prosperity. They were the two first settle-

ments formed by the Brethren in North America, and received their regular constitution as such. These two settlements soon attracted the notice of the surrounding country. The neatness and regularity which distinguished these settlements from other colonies, the peaceable deportment and industry of the inhabitants, their fairness in dealing,* and their institutions for education, gained them the respect and admiration of many who had not sufficient penetration to discover, that, whatever was truly excellent in the establishments of the Brethren, was the effect of the religious principles which governed all their proceedings.

Among their visitors, however, there were not a few whose esteem and love for the Brethren had a better foundation than the mere admiration of their civil economy. Many were disposed to join them, but to this various objections presented themselves, both to the applicants and the Brethren. In order to meet the wishes of both parties, the same measures were adopted in America which had been introduced in England. Instead of multiplying regular settlements, congregations in union with the Brethren's church were gradually formed in several towns and villages.

Congregations of this description were established between the years 1741 and 1760, in New-York, Philadelphia, Newport in Rhode Island, Bethel on the Swatara, in Lancaster, Yorktown and Graceham.

The Brethren in America, in common with the other white inhabitants, were exposed to great danger, in consequence of the war with the Indians, which broke out in 1755. On the evening of November 24th 1755, the Mission-house at Gradenhuetten, on the Mahony, was attacked by a party of Indians, who set fire to the premises, and destroyed them. Of the missionary family, eleven persons were either burnt or murdered, and only four escaped with their lives.

The Brethren, besides their regularly organized congregations, have, in almost every Protestant State in Europe, a number of friends, united in larger or smaller societies, for spiritual education in a more private way. In order to give a distinct idea of the difference between a settlement or congregation, and a society—It is necessary to remark: That the name of *society* is exclusively given to those religious associations in connection with the Brethren's Church, the members of which still attend the public ministry and the sacraments of the parish church, but have private meetings for edification among themselves, and who adopt such parts of the Brethren's constitution as are suited to their circumstances. They bear a near resemblance to the Methodist Societies, as they were founded by Wesley. In some towns, the Brethren have regular chapels, and an ordained minister of their own church serving the society. In other places the meetings are held in a private licensed house. The superintendence of these societies is committed to the elders' conference of the Unity, or to the elders of the settlement in whose vicinity they lie.

The office of superintendent of the Brethren's congregation in North America was always committed to their bishops; David Nittsman, the first bishop of the renewed church of the Brethren, Peter Boehler, John Frederic Cammerhof, Matthew Hehl, Nathaniel Seidel, and August Gotheb Spargenberg, discharged the duties of this office, either conjointly

* During a scarcity which prevailed in 1754, God so blessed their industry, that they were enabled to sell bread to their neighbors considerably below the current price.

[B. Hist. p. 401.]

or in succession, till 1762. Their official duties consisted in holding frequent visitations in all congregations and schools, in providing them with properly qualified ministers and other laborers, in maintaining the observance of the constitution of their church, and in keeping up a regular correspondence with their brethren in Europe and in the country.

For many years after the commencement of the Brethren's labor in America, the spiritual instruction of the members of their church and other friends, could not be duly attended to without great personal inconvenience and even danger. Except setting before them, in the spirit of primitive hospitality, such things as they had, the people could afford little or no aid to their ministers, who were often obliged to make many a long and toilsome journey on foot. Students, however, were raised up in the Brethren's Theological Seminary in Germany, who had the requisite zeal and self-denial, who sacrificed the temporal comforts to which they had hitherto been accustomed, and entered on a mode of life, the trials of which, nothing could sweeten but the divine blessing which accompanied their exertions. They considered themselves in the light of missionaries to the world, wherever God should open for them a door for preaching the gospel. This persuasion rendered their difficulties easy; under this conviction, even those whose station in the church, (to say nothing of their respectability as men of learning) entitled them to exemption from manual labors, did not think it derogatory to themselves, to take a part in other necessary works, whenever their ministerial duties allowed them a day of leisure.

It is related of Peter Boehler, a man of great learning, and afterward a bishop of the Brethren's Church, that he used to go with a waggon once a week to fetch flour. Cammerhof, Spangenberg, and other Brethren, acted in the same spirit, and besides the discharge of their clerical duties, willingly lent their aid in clearing the land, or following the plough, &c.

Many anecdotes might be given, which would set the character of the Moravian Missionaries in a very interesting point of view, but we are admonished, by the great length to which this article has already been drawn, to bring it to a close.

We cannot refrain, however, from relating a most tragical event, connected with the early history of this country, which occurred at a Moravian Indian village, on the Tuscarawas river, in what is now the State of Ohio, named Gradenhutzen.

These simple sons of the forest had become docile as children, under the gentle guidance of the Moravian teachers; a large number appeared truly pious, and were members of the church. Seated on the frontiers, between the contending savages and the whites, and taking sides with neither, they had become obnoxious to both, and were cruelly murdered in cold blood, to the number of ninety-four, in April, 1782, by Colonels Williamson and Crawford, and party. The Indians, thinking of no evil, were busily engaged about their domestic concerns, and, offering no resistance, suffered themselves to be all taken prisoners, to the number of ninety-four. More than half of these were women and children. In the morning, when told what was to be their fate, they mutually prayed, and exhorted each other to be resigned, and asking reciprocal forgiveness, prepared for death.

Before the order for massacre was finally issued, some of the more humane men made application to Colonel Williamson for liberty to take a child apiece to their homes, and save their lives, there being

no less than thirty or forty. Williamson, after considering a minute, answered that there were not children enough for all to have one, and lest there might be any complaining, he thought it better to let them remain on the spot with their parents and relatives; accordingly they were all massacred in cool blood, and after a night's rest for reflection. In the heat of battle, and at the sacking of a town, there may be some excuse for the indiscriminate slaughter that sometimes takes place; but in the whole annals of American warfare, no scene of deliberate murder can be found that equals this in atrocity. It is remarkable that the larger number of the men engaged in this murderous business, either came to an untimely end, or suffered losses of property and other calamities, too striking not to be noticed as marks of the retributive justice of Heaven. Williamson died poor and miserable, in the debtors prison in Washington, Pennsylvania. Crawford was taken prisoner by the Indians shortly afterwards, and burnt to death, and most of his men killed, at the defeat which bears his name on the Sandusky Plains.

Gradenhutten was first settled by the Moravian Missionaries in the year 1772. Another Missionary station was formed a few miles below, at Salem, by Mr. Heckwelder, in the spring of 1780. Here he resided with his wife Sarah, in confident security, amongst their Indian converts. The sixteenth of April, 1781, was the birth-day of their daughter, Maria, who, it is believed, was the first white child born within the present limits of the State of Ohio. In the autumn of that year, the Indians and Missionaries were forcibly removed to Detroit by the Sandusky Indians, leaving all their crops of corn standing in the fields. Having suffered much from a want of food during the winter, a part of the Indians returned in March to save what was yet left, at which time the massacre above mentioned took place.

Mr. Heckwelder had a singular trait in his character, that of believing in the power of foretelling future events. He had lived so many years secluded in the deep forests, and had, in the eye of his mind, seen the Indians so often at their labors, and his visions had been so often verified, that he had imbibed the belief that the human mind may become so deeply impressed with the approach of future events, as to predict their arrival with certainty; and from certain occurrences, he was led to believe that he himself possessed this faculty. The following singular fact is related by an ocular and still living witness. During the early years of the settlement of the Ohio company at Marietta, Mr. Heckwelder was a frequent and welcome guest. He there found men of learning and taste, whose society was congenial, and where he could again enjoy the comforts and enjoyments of social life. From his thorough knowledge of the Indian languages, he had been employed by General Rufus Putnum as an interpreter, at the treaty which he held with the Indian tribes at Vincennes, on the Wabash, in September, 1792. This duty had been accomplished, and the General had returned as far as the Falls of Ohio, where he was detained by an attack of autumnal fever, then common on the Wabash. Mr. Heckwelder had in the meantime returned by land to Marietta, in company with some of the Delaware Indians.

As the fever of the General had somewhat abated before Mr. Heckwelder left him, and the season was now advanced in November, his family at Marietta were daily expecting him, and were with great anxiety waiting for news. No news, however, could be obtained.

Mrs. Putnam, with whom Mr. Heckwelder lodged, had become very

uneasy and alarmed at the long delay of her husband, and it had been the subject of conversation before retiring to rest. In the morning, when Mr. Heckwelder appeared at the breakfast table, he told Mrs. Putnam, with a smiling countenance, that he had good news for her of the General; and proceeded to state, that in the course of the night he had had one of those mysterious communications in relation to coming events that had often been made to him in the course of his life. He said the General would return in safety on the eighteenth day of that month; and lest he should forget the day, he had in the night marked on the white-washed chimney, by the side of the bed, the number, with a piece of cut money he had in his pocket. The person who related this, and who was then a boy, immediately ran up stairs and found the figures 18 plainly marked on the chimney. This was eight or ten days before the prophetic time. The days were carefully counted, and as the time approached, many an anxious look was cast down the placid stream in search of the coming barge, when lo! on the precise day, early in the morning, the boat reached the stockaded Fort at Marietta, with the General and all the party in safety. Such is the account as given in the *American Journal*.

Ever since the year 1711, there have been annually published, under the title of "Daily Words and Texts of the Congregation of the Brethren," select texts of the Old and New Testament, containing promises, examples, &c., each of which is illustrated or applied by a verse subjoined. The Daily Words are drawn for all the days in the year, in a session of the elders conference of the Unity, from a collection of several thousand scripture pages. This manuel is always printed in time, so as to be used from the commencement of every year in all the congregations and missionary establishments of the Brethren. These Daily Words and doctrinal texts furnish subjects for the discourses addressed to the congregations of their church. For a more explicit account of the origin and use of these Daily Words, see the preface to "The Daily Words for the year 1831."

The Church of the Brethren celebrate many festival and memorial days, which refer to those events in her history, to which she ascribes her origin, revival and preservation.

The Martyrdom of John Huss, July 6th, 1415; the commencement of the Ancient Church of the Brethren, on the 1st of March, 1457; the beginning of the building of Herrnhut, June 12th, 1722; the building of the first meeting-house and academy there, May 12th, 1724; the agreement to the first statutes or rules of the congregation, May 12th, 1727; the great sealing communication of the congregation of Herrnhut, in the church at Bertholdsdorf, August 13th, 1729; the departure of the first Missionaries from Herrnhut for St. Thomas, August 21st, 1732, and for Greenland, January 19th, 1733; the blessed experience in the Unity of the Brethren, that Jesus is the Chief Shepherd and Head of his Church, on the 16th of September and 13th of November, 1741, are the events which are commemorated annually on the above mentioned days in the church of the Brethren. (The circumstantial narrative of these events is to be found in "Memorial Days of the Ancient and Renewed Church of the Brethren.")

Regarding marriage, it has been agreed upon among the United Brethren, that none shall take place without the consent of the Board of elders of the congregation. Upon due application this consent is

signified to the parties, whereupon they are solemnly betrothed, in presence of the elders and nearest connexions, and the marriage then takes place, according to the forms prescribed by law in each country.

The following is a List of the Congregations, Societies and Missions of the Church of the United Brethren, at the close of the first century, since its renewal.

I. CONGREGATIONS.

IN EUROPE.

In Upper Lusatia there are four congregations—2,135 members.*

In Silesia—Thirteen congregations—4,156 members.

In Great Britain—Twenty congregations—3,432 members.

In Ireland—Six congregations—1,265 members.

IN ASIA,

One Congregation—449 members.

IN NORTH AMERICA.

In Pennsylvania—Eleven congregations—2,860 members.

In Ohio—Three congregations—352 members.

In New-York—Two congregations—432 members.

In Rhode Island—One congregation—50 members.

In Maryland—One congregation—341 members.

In North Carolina—Six congregations—1,670 members.

II. SOCIETIES.

In Germany and Prussia—Fifteen societies—31,336 members. (Returns incomplete.)

In Switzerland and France—Seven societies—2,664 members. (Returns incomplete.)

In Denmark, Norway and Sweden—Twenty-two societies—42,300 members.

III. MISSIONS.

In Greenland, since 1733—(Among the Natives on the Western Coast,) Three congregations, eighteen missionaries, 966 converts.

On the Coast of Zabrador, since 1770—(Among the Esquimaux Indians,) Three congregations, twenty-five missionaries, 607 converts.

In North America, since 1734—(Among the Delaware and Cherokee Indians,) Three congregations, seven missionaries, 180 converts.

In South America, since 1738—(Among the Negro population,) One station, eleven missionaries, 1,388 converts.

IN THE WEST INDIES—(Among the negro slaves:)

In the Danish West Indies—Seven stations, thirty-six missionaries, 8,250 converts.

In the British West Indies—Twelve stations, thirty-five missionaries, 16,447 converts.

IN SOUTH AFRICA,

Since 1792—Three stations, thirty-six missionaries, 1,729 converts.

IN RUSSIAN ASIA,

(Among the Calmucs.)—*Island in the Wolga, near Sarepta*—3 missionaries, 22 converts.

Recapitulations of numbers.—Members in communion, 16,125; In Societies, 79,184; Converts in Missions, 33,169.

* The number of members include the children and refer to the year 1822.

From the preceding accounts which have been chiefly taken from accredited histories of the Brethren's Church; it will be seen that they have been a singular people, and that many of the peculiarities which constitute their singularity, are those which should always characterize the church of Christ—a spirit of humility and self-denial—and of active zeal in spreading the good news and glad tidings of salvation, wherever a door of utterance could be found.

We see that when they were *in number very few and without a sure abode*, and in the midst of great poverty, they undertook to preach the gospel to the most destitute, those who sat in darkness and saw no light; and it may be observed, that the Moravians, at least, are not obnoxious to the charge, perhaps justly made, by a late writer in this periodical—that where there was no refinement in a country, and where there was nothing left but the bare circumstance of enlightening the heathen, it seemed to be an object which alone had not sufficient charms to enlist the energies of most missionaries. For the bleak and inhospitable climate of “Greenland’s icy mountains,” where there was neither refinement nor comfort; amongst the negro slaves in the West Indies, and the christian slaves in Algiers, were the places where the Brethren first labored. They left little room to doubt of the purity of their motives, and of their singular disinterestedness. Some of them actually selling themselves for slaves, that they might thereby have an opportunity of preaching Christ to the oppressed African.

It was this peculiar trait of benevolence to the destitute, which characterized the Moravians, that first induced the compiler of these sketches to endeavor to bring their history more particularly to notice in our own church. Being impressed with the belief that we, as a church, have not, as we ought to have, that spirit of devotedness to the cause of our Master, which characterized the church in the days of the Apostles, that we seem to think that it is not required of us *now*, that we be followers together of such a man as Paul, that it would be considered as super-service to take for an example men, who were willing to spend and be spent in the service of Christ; believing that we have much need of examining ourselves, whether we are *rendering according to the benefits received*, these sketches were designed to show that others, whom we justly considered as not having attained to that degree of clearness in doctrine, government and discipline, which we claim, have yet, in their missionary labors, set us an example worthy of our imitation. Shall we, who, in the good providence of God, have been delivered from the darkness of popery and prelacy, and who have received from our covenanting fathers such a clear exposition of the scriptures, as are contained in our confession of faith, we, who have been enabled to reject the will-worship and ceremonies which the Moravians have fallen into, shall we not do *more than others*?

ADELPHE.

ART. II. *Slavery essentially immoral.*

(Concluded from page 325)

The Apostle did indeed give directions, pointing out the relative duties of *master* and *servant*, by which he recognized the relation to be

lawful. It is here we presume, the mistake is made. The Apostle mentions, *masters* and *servants*. We know from profane history, that there was a system of slavery, similar to our own, then practised in the Roman Empire; and consequently many infer that it must be servants held by that system, which the Apostle referred to; and they go to the Roman heathen statute book, instead of the Bible, to understand the tenure by which they were held, and the laws that were to regulate the system. But when the Apostle gave directions regulating the conduct of *master* and *servant*, it must be such a servitude, as was recognised by God's laws. The servant's duty to his master must not come in competition with his duty to God. It can not disannul God's other general precepts, by which all are to be governed. It must not stop a man from entering legally into the marriage relation, which is the covenant of his God, and the first link in the chain of all social ties; which if broken, all others are severed. But *slaves* can make no contracts which are binding, consequently every male and female slave, who live as husband and wife, live in a state of concubinage, so far as civil law is concerned—But let this suffice to shew, that the servant's duty to his master must not come in collision with God's precepts.

The Apostle in writing to the different churches, was writing to people who had been admitted to church fellowship. They had already acceded to the terms of communion; we could not expect him to make any new terms; their slaves had already been disposed of according to the requisitions of the gospel, though they still retained them, or a portion of them in their employment; accordingly he instructs the masters to treat them with "justice and equality," and to "forbear threatening"—threatening that they would again reduce them to their former state of bondage; as we presume they depended solely on the christian principles of their masters, for their protection. He does not say you shall not brand them with hot irons, or you shall not suspend them with a weight tied to their feet—when you apply the whip until it lacerates their naked bodies, or other barbarities, which were then used. The Apostle would not have such barbarities as much as named amongst Christians, and which we know are practised in our own country, and which are necessary appendages to the system—When man is yoked to labor like the brute, like the brute he must be coerced, nay worse than the brute, for he will not work under the yoke so tamely. The Apostle exhorts the servants to discharge their duty with "fidelity," a very necessary advice to a people emerging from a heathen state. Servants might suppose that a religion, which breathed so much benevolence and love, and had such an equalizing tendency, made it no more necessary for them to labor—that the benevolence of their brethren in the church, should support them, or that they should have all things common.

There was another class of servants whom he addressed, who were actually slaves, who had heathen masters, those he exhorted to exercise christian-patience and to be diligent and faithful in their business, that the word of God might not be blasphemed. Not that they owed the labor in justice to their masters; nor was there any need to promulgate any new laws respecting slavery, for the fundamental principles of the christian religion utterly condemned it. It could not be maintained without sapping their foundation principles—supreme love to God, and love to our neighbors. The judicial law was full and explicit, giving directions regulating the Hebrew servitude. (Dent. xv. and 12, 13, 14, 15.) The moral part of this law is always binding—for as we have already

said, the standard of moral obligation, in respect of love to our neighbor, is certainly no lower under the Christian dispensation than under the Jewish.

When the Apostle gave directions for the discharge of other relative duties, did he recognize the absurd and wicked laws, by which these relations were governed in the Roman Empire? By no means. He gave directions for the discharge of the relative duties of husband and wife, and parents and children; now we know that the wife was reckoned by the Roman laws the husband's slave; and he had the same authority over her as over his slaves. The father had as much authority over his children, as he had over his slaves, in some respects the father's authority over his child, was more absolute than over his slave. A son could not do business for himself in his father's lifetime, except his father first emancipated him, in a formal manner three different times; and a slave was made free by being but once emancipated. Now the Apostle did not consider it necessary to say any thing against any of these absurdities, he intended we should go to the Bible for our instructions. Some of our pro-slavery friends seem to be of the opinion, that if the Apostle had preached the duty of emancipation, it would have made such an *uproar*, that we certainly should have heard of it, and that the Apostle was awed from preaching this christian duty, because he was afraid of the displeasure of the despots, who were then in power. Now the Apostle was "no tame, time-serving priest." He knew that, "the fear of man bringeth a snare." He was not afraid to "lay the axe to the root of the tree," to their idolatry, of which slavery is the legitimate offspring. Do we suppose that they would be more attached to their slaves than to their gods? The Apostle did not appear to be afraid to tell them, that "they were no gods, that were made with hands." Though alas! christians in our day seem to be more attached to *their system of slavery*, than to *the laws of their God*.

Emancipation was not so rare an occurrence, in the Roman Empire, that it needed to make such a great commotion—humane masters gave slaves greater facilities for obtaining their freedom, under the Roman government, than do our American slave-holders. Cicero says, that "sober industrious slaves, at least such as became slaves from being captives in war, seldom remained in servitude above six years." There were laws in the Roman Empire at one time, prohibiting persons from emancipating more than a portion of their slaves; for the emancipation had been so great, previous to that time, that they became alarmed for the safety of their system, which shews that emancipation was not so very unpopular amongst the people. The Apostle's greatest effort was directed against idolatry, but he does not particularize every evil, which flowed out of that system. There were many crimes existing in the Roman Empire, which the Apostle did not in precise language reprove; yet to construe his silence into an approval, would be as great a slander on his character, as to say he approved of slavery. Did he approve of their gladiatorial shows? because "they are not in the catalogue of crimes" that he has mentioned and which were most barbarous spectacles of cruelty and murder. A duelist might say, that the Apostle approved of duelling, because there was more barbarity manifested in the gladiatorial shows than in duelling, and these shows were practised to a great extent in the Roman Empire in his days; but he did not express any disapprobation of them, on the contrary, he borrowed figures from them, to represent the christian's warfare; "So fight I not, as one that

beateth the air." Fathers in the Roman Empire exposed their children, when infants, in such a manner, that death was the consequence; and even when they came to the years of maturity, they put them to death by any punishment they saw proper to select. Deeds of this kind were of common occurrence. The Apostle in his catalogue of crimes, says nothing about those deeds of atrocity committed by fathers. Did he therefore approve of them?

Nor would it do to say that in all cases, wherever God gave commandments, regulating transactions, that it was equivalent to an approval. Did God approve of Laban's pursuit after Jacob, in search of his gods, when he gave him directions how he should conduct himself on his interview with Jacob? There is no evidence, that he said one word to him respecting his idolatrous designs after his gods? Did he approve of Balaam's journey to Moab, with a view of cursing Israel? God even told Balaam to go with the messengers of Balak, and yet he highly disapproved of his mission, and the motives by which he was impelled? And did not Christ say to Judas, "what thou doest do quickly?"

Is it true, that Christ and his Apostles did not give slavery a rebuke? Did not Christ preach an emancipation sermon in Nazareth from this text? (See Luke iv. 18, 19.) "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." The great Jubilee trumpet was to be blown, but it may be said that this is all prefiguring spiritual maladies which are to be remedied by spiritual blessings. Grant, that these are principally intended, but notwithstanding, it is to be literally fulfilled. Christ's precepts and example, were as far removed from slave-holding, as the east is distant from the west. He showed a tender regard, both for the souls and bodies of men. He stooped to the humblest offices to teach us humility. The criterion by which his disciples were to be distinguished from the world, was their love one to another, and they were to do good to all men; and he prohibited any thing like a domineering spirit amongst his followers. He said, "whosoever would be chief, let him be servant," and gave himself as the example to be imitated.

If a person wanted authority, let him become more useful to his fellow men. Now this is the very principle which runs through all God's institutions. God never gave authority to any individual, to lord it over his fellow men—for the exclusive benefit of himself. And he gave one rule, by which our whole intercourse with our fellow men is to be governed, which would root out slavery, were there not another text in the Bible to say one word on the subject, namely: "*whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.*"

We will now examine whether slavery may not be legitimately included amongst the catalogues of crimes, given by the Apostles. "No covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God, nor extortioners, adulterers, disobedient to parents, proud, boasters, lovers of their own selves, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God, inventors of evil things, without natural affections, implacable, unmerciful, effeminate, hateful and hating one another, *men-stealers*, or (as Greek scholars say it should

be rendered) *men-dealers*." We have put down covetousness first, as that is the source from which slavery flows—the love of money, which is the root of all evil,—*avarice*.

We have no Dictionary of the English language at hand, except Walker, who defines covetousness to be "avarice" "greediness of gain," &c. "Extortioner" is derived from "extort," which is thus defined: "to draw by force, to force away, to wrest, to wring from one, to gain by violence or oppression, or by usury." The Apostle says (1st Corinthians, v. 11,) "If any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one no not to eat." Now if slave-holders are not "covetous, extortioners," we would not know where to find such characters. And the text just quoted, we think, is an ample justification of the course which the Secession church has pursued in excluding slave-holders from church fellowship. We bless God for the faithfulness to which they have already attained on this subject—the discipline of the church being an appointed means in the hand of God to reclaim froward sinners; and we humbly pray it may be made effectual for this end.

But to return. As it respects "adultery," slavery is a system of adultery, and does in all cases produce this evil fruit, as in the plenitude of its power, it refuses to acknowledge the legality of the marriage covenant, entered into by its victims. Also by the same assumption of power, it prevents parents and children from discharging their reciprocal duties, and consequently, is chargeable with "disobedience to parents." Slavery is awfully chargeable with generating that wicked disposition "hateful and hating one another." Slavery has a tendency to degrade its victims to the level of the brute that perisheth. Is not that the reason why we despise our colored brethren, and refuse them that love and courtesy which God has commanded us to extend to all the human family? We are also constrained to believe that the Apostle James had slave-holders in view, when he drew his picture—it has such a striking resemblance to the original, (James, v. 1-5.)

What we have dwelt upon in this discussion, is the system of slavery, (separate and apart from its practical enormities) viz. the principle of holding man as property. If it is lawful to hold man as property, it will justify the greater part of the enormities of the system. In short, if man is property, we are authorised to dispose of him in any way which would best subserve our interest, however it might agonize his tenderest affections. He must be entirely at the disposal of the owner. We think it quite consistent with the principles of the system, that he should have the power of life and death, and indeed it is a mere pretence to say he has not. We are all aware of the corrupting influence of absolute dominion. Hence it plainly appears there is no remedy for the flagrant practical evils arising from slavery, but to *eradicate the root, cut off the property-holding power*. Now we think we have given scripture, and arguments enough to show that man is not lawful property, and cannot be held as such, without highly infracting God's laws; and whoever holds him as such, is accessory to all the enormities of the system. It is humiliating in this enlightened age to be put to the necessity of adducing a series of arguments, to demonstrate, that a man belongs to himself, that he owns his own bones and muscles, and mental faculties, when he is in actual possession of them—the possession of which, and God giving laws how he is to exert those faculties, is proof positive, that, so far as man is concerned, he is the sole proprietor. Can

there a doubt remain that it is not highly immoral to extort those faculties from the rightful owners, and appropriate them to our own use? Is it not *man-stealing*?

Now we think if we have been so happy as to make ourselves understood, that we have succeeded in showing that slavery is essentially immoral in itself, or in other words, *is sin*. It is both "a want of conformity unto, and a transgression of the law of God." We will now test the qualities of this system by the fruit it bears. It is generally customary to show the sufferings inflicted on the slave, in order to delineate the evils of slavery—but we will show the moral evils that it inflicts on the upholders and abettors of this system. And for this purpose we will give the testimony of slave-holders themselves.

In a short extract from a pamphlet, published some time since by order of the Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, is the following: "The influence," say they, "of the negroes upon the moral and religious interests of the whites, is destructive in the extreme. We cannot go into especial detail. It is unnecessary. We make our appeal to universal experience. We are *chained to a putrid carcase*—it sickens and destroys us. We have a mill stone hanged about the neck of our society, to sink us deep in the sea of vice. Our children are corrupting from their infancy, nor can we prevent it. Many an anxious parent, like the missionaries in foreign lands, wishes that his children could be brought up beyond the reach of the influence of the depraved heathen. Nor is this influence confined to mere childhood. If that were all, it would be tremendous. But it follows us into youth, into manhood, and into old age. In all our intercourse with them, (the slaves) we are undergoing a process of intellectual and moral deterioration; and it requires almost superhuman effort to maintain a high standing, either for intelligence or piety." What a deplorable picture of moral depravity, and intellectual deterioration! Their own mouths have testified against them.

These Rev. Gentlemen ("blind guides" we fear) were investigating the practical enormities of their system, in order to remedy the evils of it, without any idea of its abandonment. If they had applied this unerring test to the case in hand, and applied the remedy provided in such cases, they would have showed themselves more like "scribes who were instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," viz. "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit, every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is *hewn down and cast into the fire*." We see that our slave-holding brethren, by forging chains for others, have become enchained themselves. They say "we are chained to a putrid carcase, it sickens and destroys us." *O wretched men that they are; who shall deliver them from this body of death?* Christ says, "come unto me all ye that are weary, and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "Let them loose the bands of wickedness, undo the heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free," and that will break *every yoke*; let them *unchain the slave*, and then they will *themselves also be unchained*. Satan has nothing but chains in his kingdom, but mankind are prone to cling to them as though they were regal ornaments. It is truly astonishing to see with what pertinacity they cling to this sinful institution. The god of this world hath blinded their eyes. Is christianity so impotent that she is to yield to the giant grasp of this foe of God and man? Has it chariots of iron, and therefore are men not able to throst it out of the church of God? Is not the omnipotent God pledg-

ed for the existence and extension of Christianity? And he is King of kings and Lord of Hosts. Christianity has no need to immolate human victims on the altar of slavery, to satiate the appetite of avarice and despotism to gain admittance into the world. And what would it gain by such admittance? why forsooth, it would gain slave-holding members to its churches, and thus obtain the *mighty* and the *noble*. This would ingratiate us into the favor of slave-holders, and they themselves being persuaded of the evils of slavery, we might thus procure their aid, as they are the only people who have power to abolish it. But we have no need of any unholy alliances, for the purpose of eradicating slavery, or any other immorality; as "he whose fan is in his hand will thoroughly purge his floor." We humbly hope that there are many amongst the slave-holders, who are bewailing the evils of slavery—we feel for their unhappy situation, but we think there should be action on the subject, as faith without works is dead. The God that sustained Moses and Aaron in their enterprize, can also sustain them. They may be few in number, though if an host encamp against them, they need not be afraid; if the Lord of Hosts be on their side, one shall chase a thousand. They ought not to forget to avail themselves of that powerful auxiliary, prayer.

We think if our brethren in the slave-holding States, who were formerly members of the Secession Church, had a due estimate of the privileges of God's house, they would not for so slight a cause as the abjuration of slavery, give up their fellowship in the church. There is no judgment more to be deprecated, than the removal of the candlestick. If that fails to awaken, God will send desolating judgments, that may be felt; for he is pledged to hear the groans of the oppressed. The terms of the Secession Church, can not operate on them with more loss to their pecuniary interest, than did our Saviour's to the young man in the gospel,—“Sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor,” &c. Christ will not have a rival in our affections. They are not required by the act of the Secession Church to give any of their property to the poor, they are only required to return to the poor what is evidently their own, viz. their bones and muscles. The officers of Christ's house have no authority to make the terms of church fellowship any wider than Christ has made them. Christ does not allow his ministers, when fishing for men, to use the world for a bait. He said except ye forsake all, ye cannot be my disciples. They have no authority to give indulgences to commit sin, from any supposed benefit arising from it; though obedience to God's commands has the promise of temporal blessings, as well as spiritual, as far as it is for God's glory, and their own good. And recent occurrences fully demonstrate, that emancipation is profitable, even as it respects pecuniary interests.

There is another class of mankind that the ministers of Christ have a special message to, viz. the wounded, the despoiled, the distressed, the afflicted and the down-trodden. To these they are to act as did the good Samaritan, and to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the broken hearted, and preach deliverance to the captives. Ethiopia is also to stretch out her hands to God. Would it not be enough to petrify the heart of the slave, and to forever seal it against a religion that would sanction the oppressor in robbing him of every thing that endears human existence, and putting him to grind in the prison house? Could they think God pities them, as a father pities his children, when he approves of their brethren of mankind, in thrusting them from the society of men,

and ranking them with the beasts of the field; blotting out their name from under heaven, so that they are known on the earth only as beasts of burden for their brethren, and excluded from the privilege of showing their love to their Saviour by keeping his commandments? Could they believe that they had a mansion in their father's house in the heavens, if when traveling through the pilgrimage journey of this world, they are made to think that it is by God's authority they are thus treated, as if they were an execration on the earth?

We will now close our remarks. We feel that we have too heavily taxed the pages of the Monitor, and the patience of its readers, by the length of this essay. When commencing this article, we had no idea of making any more than a few passing remarks, as we said, on the sentiments adduced by our brother A. R., and others on his side of the question; but our anxiety for the extirpation of slavery, the scourge and disgrace of mankind, from our country, has inadvertently led us, step by step, into this protracted discussion. We hope A. R. will once more minutely view this subject through the glass of God's word. We give him full credit for his integrity of purpose, but he is certainly doing a very great unkindness to those he would wish to befriend—they certainly have no need of opiates, they have more need of a voice of thunder to arouse them from their lethargy, lest they *sleep the sleep of death*. Every friend to his God, friend to his country and friend to his species, should lend his aid for the removal of so pernicious an institution. We would hail that day with peculiar delight, when slavery will be abolished, not only in our own country, which with all its faults we sincerely love but *that it will be abolished* throughout all the world. We would consider it a harbinger of that blessed day when God will take unto himself his great power and reign; when the "kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

ANTI-SAVERY.

ART. III. *An examination of the decision of the Associate Synod of 1838, respecting the two parties claiming to be the Presbytery of Albany.*

There is a common propensity among men to judge between contending parties, and to espouse the cause of the one or the other; and this propensity is not always restrained till the means of forming a correct judgment are afforded. In the decision of the late Synod respecting the parties claiming to be the Associate Presbytery of Albany, the means of forming a correct judgment are only exhibited partially and in a scattered form; some of them being contained in the Minutes of preceding years, and in other publications, some only to be ascertained by comparisons of different documents, and others again only known to such as were present to hear the statements of the parties, and the reasonings of the members of Synod. It is a judicious method in church courts, when any decision of importance is made, to accompany it with the reasons which gave rise to it. This however the Synod has not fully done in the present case, and, in consequence of this, mistaken apprehensions have prevailed to some extent. Although not possessing any authority from the Synod to interpret their views, or presuming to suppose that the views to be expressed will be found exactly agreeing with those which influenced their decision, I hope I may be allowed as an in-

dividual to state my opinion, and my *belief* of what was the opinion of others.

To understand this case correctly, it is necessary to give a history of it. In 1836, the Presbytery of Albany referred to the Synod which met at Philadelphia, a libel against the Rev. Andrew Stark, charging him with a number of flagrant offences, and assigning as reasons for the reference, that he had refused to obey their citations, and had also in a written communication, peremptorily refused to be tried by them. A question has since arisen respecting the true character of this latter paper, whether it be a total declinature, or only a declinature in the particular case to be tried. Mr. Stark now alleges that he only declined the authority of the Presbytery in this particular case. He says of this paper, "It was merely a statement of his reasons, why he thought the Presbytery ought not to try the libel they had laid against him." (*Associate Presbyterian Magazine*, p. 18.) In the paper, however, both the language and the reasons are general, implying that he would not be judged by the Presbytery in any case, but would hold all their proceedings as null and void. He does not say, I protest against their trying me in *this case*, but "I protest against their interfering with me *in any way*, and that I shall hold as null and void and of no account, *whatever decisions* they may make." Candour would readily attribute this general language to inadvertence, had the reasons of the protest been special; but they are of the same general character, and if correct would prove the Presbytery not only disqualified for the trial of Mr. Stark in any case, but for the trial of any body else. He states in his first reason, not simply that the Presbytery were not disinterested in this case, but in general terms, that they had destroyed "their character for disinterestedness, impartiality and fair dealing." That it was quite evident to him that such a court "could not act on the principles of truth and righteousness," and that "it would be perfectly idle to expect justice from it." "If," says he, "I were as innocent as my Master himself, I could expect nothing else than to be condemned by such a court, provided it might suit its policy. Therefore a trial" (not *this* trial, but indefinitely, *any trial*) "before such a court is, in my humble opinion, a very needless formality." The remaining reasons are of the same general character. He accuses the Presbytery of slandering him because they had been witnesses against him; and refuses altogether to be tried by them, till they would try themselves and some others whom he names. He says that his confidence in the Presbytery was destroyed, that they had lost all just claim to respect, that they had "done all they could do, to destroy all distinction between truth and falsehood, and to establish a most heartless, spiritual despotism," and that he could not "in any way countenance the Presbytery in a course of backsliding."

Now it may be safely left to any candid reader, without further remark, whether a declinature stated in such general terms, based on such general reasons, and accompanied by no appeal to the superior court, ought not to be regarded as a total and final declinature, both of the Presbytery and of the church. It may also be left to every such person to judge whether the man presenting it and refusing to withdraw it, could with any consistency be admitted to a seat in the court whose character he thus persisted in reviling, and whose authority he thus persisted to despise. It is difficult to reconcile his claiming a seat with either christian or honorable feelings; yet if he could be so wanting in

self-respect as to make one among those whom he professes to regard as so utterly abandoned, it does not follow that they should so far forego their self-respect as to sit with him on these terms. It is not to be supposed that the Synod could ever have deliberately intended this, and there is none of their acts which affords any evidence of such intention.

It is indeed true, that Mr. Stark was allowed, after handing in this paper, to sit as a member in Synod, (having been notified to attend,) but this cannot prove that the paper was not a declinature, nor that it might not be so regarded both by the Presbytery and Synod, for though noticed by the Presbytery in their report as exceptionable on this very account, as well as on account of the heavy charges which it contains, it was never formally considered, so as to pass any judgment upon it or its author.* It might be regarded as the party ebullition of disordered passions, or as an inconsiderate expression of what the writer did not really intend, and which in moments of more deliberation, he might choose to withdraw. Judgment upon it was postponed, and the only use made of it was to read it in Synod, as one of the chief reasons for referring the libel. It is of importance to observe, that this paper itself was not referred to the Synod, but was expressly reserved for future judgment by the Presbytery. It seems to be the impression of some that all matters affecting the standing of Mr. Stark, had been before the Synod which met at Pittsburgh in 1837, and that therefore the Presbytery of Albany had no right to take up this paper or any thing affecting his standing previously to that meeting. The error of this impression will be clearly manifested by consulting the Report of the Presbytery of Albany, in which, after referring the libel against Mr. Stark, they say:

“*Resolved*, further, that the Presbytery still retain the right, if they shall think it proper, hereafter to call Mr. Stark to account for the truly offensive and libellous matter contained in his reasons of protest, which go before the Synod, and also in the paper alluded to, in which he gives his reasons for refusing to be tried by this Presbytery.” (Rel. Mon. v. xiii. p. 25.)

The latter of the papers mentioned was the declinature, of which the Presbytery had complained as containing “cruel, unjust and slanderous statements.” The Synod did not examine these papers or pass any judgment respecting them, but not only acquiesced in their being retained in the hands of the Presbytery for future judgment,* but they explicitly referred them to that Presbytery, with orders to deal with Mr. Stark respecting them. The following are the words of their act: “On motion, *Resolved*, that as exceptions have been taken against the papers of Mr. Stark on various accounts, these papers are hereby referred to the Presbytery of Albany, to deal with him respecting them.” (See Minutes as above, p. 32.) After Mr. Stark was convicted and suspended, he handed in another paper declining the authority of the Synod, which was also referred to the Presbytery. (See Minutes as above, p. 40.) Thus it appears that there were three different papers in the hands of that Presbytery, viz:—Mr. Stark’s Reasons of Protest, his Declinature of the Presbytery, and his Declinature of the Synod, for all or any of which, it was their right and duty, to deal with him, with the consent and by the order of Synod. The Pres-

* The Synod did so far act on that paper as to decide unanimously that in it Mr. Stark had declined the authority of his Presbytery; and this greatly adds to our correspondent’s argument. (See Minutes, p. 29.)—[Ed. Rel. Mon.]

bytery however during the succeeding year, did not act on any of these papers, as Mr. Stark continued to preach in contempt of the deed of Synod, did not claim a seat in the Presbytery, and might be properly considered as having withdrawn from all connexion with the Associate Church.

At the Synod which met at Pittsburgh, May, 1837, agreeably to various petitions, and with the consent and votes of a number who had previously voted and still believed Mr. Stark legally and justly convicted, it was decided, "to review the Synod's deed of last year in the case of Mr. Stark." It was also decided that he should be relieved from the sentence of suspension which had been passed against him. Afterwards a resolution was adopted convicting him of insubordination, but further proceeding in the case was deferred till the next meeting, when the deed of the former Synod was to be reviewed. In none of these cases was there any action upon the paper of declinature, or reasons of protest reserved by the Presbytery of Albany, or the declinature of Synod referred to them at the previous meeting. No judgment was passed respecting these papers, nor any thing done directly or indirectly taking them out of the hands of the Presbytery. The thing could not have been legally done as they were not brought up by reference or appeal, nor was it attempted. The deeds of the Synod make no mention of *the whole case*, but in all their details are expressly limited to the libel on which Mr. Stark had been convicted, and to his subsequent insubordination.

It seems to have been taken for granted by some, that, because, as they allege, Mr. Stark was restored to good standing by the Synod, nothing could be done to affect his standing during the year. This is quite a novel doctrine, and exhibits Mr. Stark in the light of a very favorite child, having an immunity from all process in all supposable cases. Presbyteries have often dealt with others whose standing was at least equally good, without any charge of rebellion against the superior court. Whence then did Mr. Stark derive this peculiar right, not to be touched by his Presbytery? If the Presbytery had attempted to reverse any of the deeds of Synod; if they had entered upon any part of the process which the Synod had taken into their own hands; if they had renewed the sentence of suspension from the ministry for the offences charged in the libel, or in any way interfered with those things which were in the Synod's hands, there would have been room for the charge of insubordination. But they did none of these things; they only judged of things which were in their own hands, with the knowledge, consent, and express order of the Synod.

Subsequently to the above-mentioned deed relieving Mr. Stark from suspension, he appeared and claimed his seat as a member of the Presbytery of Albany, and for all that appears to the contrary, they were ready to admit him, out of respect to the authority of Synod, notwithstanding the heavy charges of which he stood convicted by a large majority of the votes of Synod, and in the minds of all acquainted with the facts of the case. They however judged that he ought to withdraw the declinature in which he had brought the charges against them before noticed, and declared that he would hold all their proceedings as null and void. Though in reserving this paper, they had characterized it as "cruel, unjust and slanderous," instead of instituting a process against him for this and the other papers containing libellous matter, they adopted the lenient and pacific course of passing the latter papers without notice, and merely requiring him to withdraw the former. He and others for

him plead that this was virtually done when he claimed his seat. It would seem much more just to say, that the declinature and the charges contained in it were virtually renewed, when at the request of a member or members of the court he refused to withdraw them. In consequence of this refusal, the Presbytery rejected his application for a seat, and though they have not assigned their reasons in their minutes, they have done it elsewhere. They did not suspend Mr. Stark, or interfere in any way with his ministry, but only stood upon their own rights as a Presbytery, refusing to recognize as a brother member one who persisted in thrusting upon them a declinature in which he refused all submission to their authority, reviled them as the worst of men, and plainly enough told them that he considered himself no brother of theirs. They could not with any propriety take in among them one who like a bishop or pope would judge them, but would not himself be judged by them. They regarded this as utterly subversive of Presbyterian purity and of Christian liberty.

The Presbytery assign as another ground of their refusal, the vote of Synod convicting Mr. Stark of insubordination; a scandal not purged. The principle of this reason is obviously correct, but as the Synod involved itself in the inconsistency of convicting Mr. Stark, and then leaving him unpunished, this reason reflected on that deed of the superior court; and though the principle of it be correct, it was not necessary to their defence. The former reason is amply sufficient; and the propriety or impropriety of introducing this need not be debated. A hundred weak or wrong reasons will not invalidate an act for which there is one good reason, any more than weak and insufficient arguments will invalidate the truth. This decision of the Presbytery, even if wrong, was not an act of disobedience to Synod, nor so evidently wrong as to be pronounced "of itself null and void," without being reconsidered and reversed.

A protest accompanied with an appeal was entered against this decision by "Messrs. Bullions, Stark and Blair;" and if they had been wronged, by prosecuting this appeal, they might in a regular way have obtained redress. The course however which they chose to pursue was very different.

As Mr. Stark's case was to come before the next meeting of Synod at Philadelphia, in May, 1838, it became a special object with him and his friends, to secure if possible a majority in his favor. A missionary was sent forth, and money raised to bring on such as it was thought would befriend him. It was also made sufficiently evident at the meeting of the Synod, that among the measures concerted, was the securing by a full and timely meeting of Mr. Stark's friends in one or more Presbyteries, a majority in his favor, who should, when the other members arrived exclude them from their seats, and so prevent them from being members at the organization of the ensuing Synod. This plot is the true key to the subsequent proceedings of Mr. Stark and his friends in the Presbytery of Albany. But what proof, it may be asked, appeared before Synod to warrant so serious a charge? The proof was so ample and so convincing that even the friends of Mr. Stark did not deny it. One of the persons concerned in this plot owned it upon the floor of Synod, stating that they had been long praying for such an opportunity, and that Providence had answered their prayers even beyond their expectation. Connected with the Resolutions published by these brethren in the 3d No. of their Magazine as the the pacific measure rejected by Synod,* there

*These resolutions are erroneously attributed to the Rev. Mr. Rodgers, and erroneously and to have been moved by Mr. Rodgers and seconded by Mr. Bell.

was one to this amount, and nearly in these very words—"Resolved, that Dr. P. Bullions, Messrs. Stark and Blair are censurable for the hasty manner in which they constituted the Associate Presbytery of Albany, without waiting for the arrival of their brethren, and also for the manifestations which they have given of intrigue in so doing." Why have these men in giving to the world an account of what their friends attempted in their favor, omitted this resolution which would have revealed what these friends thought of their proceedings? The resolution is repeated from memory after an interval of half a year, but though it no doubt varies somewhat in words, it does not reflect on the conduct of these men more than the original. Their omission of it is a tolerable specimen of the dependence to be placed on their statements.

It appeared from the papers and other representations of the two parties claiming to be the Associate Presbytery of Albany, that this Presbytery was to meet, by adjournment, at Albany, on the morning of April 18th, 1838. In conformity with the plan which had been adopted, Mr. Stark, who had not attended before since his exclusion on the 28th of the preceding June, was now present with an elder, though his arrival in the city was not known to the other party till they found him occupying a seat in the Presbytery. Mr. H. H. Blair called upon Mr. Martin early in the morning to ascertain whether a distant member had arrived whose presence might have materially deranged their plans, but to his great gratification, and as an answer to his prayers, he found that he had not arrived; and he hurried away to convey to his brethren the welcome intelligence. Things being in this state, Dr. P. Bullions, Messrs. Stark and Blair, with their elders, met at the appointed place, and at the precise time to which the Presbytery stood adjourned. Without waiting for their brethren, who were known to be in the city and not twenty rods distant, they constituted with prayer, and proceeded to transact some very important business.

Mr. Stark is mentioned in their minutes, together with his elder, as among the members constituting the Presbytery. They say, "The Associate Presbytery of Albany met, and was constituted with prayer by the Rev. H. H. Blair, Moderator. Members present, Rev. P. Bullions," (clerk pro tem.) "Messrs. Stark and Blair, ministers, together with Messrs. Whitewright, Brinkerhoff and Black, ruling elders." But though they had thus made him a constituent member in the act of meeting, they proceeded to constitute him a member a second time. The way in which this was done, certainly deserves the credit of originality; and as they claim in connexion with their friends to be the Scotch party, and have often told us of their being the learned, respectable and pious portion of the church, this specimen of their wisdom deserves a little examination. It is questionable whether any other six men in the country would have hit on the same way of getting over a difficulty.

It is a common principle in both civil and ecclesiastical courts, that their acts must be held as valid till legally reversed. Even if illegal, the law provides ways in which this is to be ascertained and declared; and to set aside in an illegal manner such acts, would only be trampling on law to maintain the honor of the law. On the supposition that the exclusion of Mr. Stark was illegal, two ways of redress presented themselves, agreeable to established order. On one of these ways these brethren had entered by protesting and appealing to the higher court, but this process was too tedious to answer some other purposes, and was abandoned. Another method in which the same thing might have been done,

was the reconsideration and reversal of their former deed by the court itself. To this, however, common order presented a difficulty of considerable magnitude. Rules of discipline provide that motions for reconsideration must proceed from those who voted with the majority, so that by this fact it may be perceived that there is not merely a change of members in the court, but to some extent a change of mind. Here then was the difficulty in the present case; as there were no members present who had voted for the exclusion of Mr. Stark, a motion for reconsideration could not even be made without a direct violation of established rules. In this emergency, the following expedient was adopted: "Dr. Bullions gave notice that he withdrew his protest against the decision of Presbytery excluding Mr. Stark from a seat," and what then? did he say, he was now satisfied that that decision was just, and that he would no more oppose it? Instead of this, he seems to have supposed that this shooting in an opposite direction had quite nullified the deed. He says, "that decision being in itself null and void, because in opposition to a decision of Synod." What if the other protesters had not followed his example, as they however did, but adhered to their protests? They would then have come up to Synod in opposition to the act, and Dr. Bullions as acquiescing in it! This, certainly, to say the least of it, is a new invention, to withdraw protests in order to nullify the deeds against which they had been entered. But by this singular step Mr. Stark was admitted to a seat in the Presbytery whose authority he persisted in declining, and whose act excluding him was yet unreversed. If under these circumstances he was not illegally admitted both in fact and in form, it would be difficult to say when an admission could be illegal.

The admission of Mr. Stark's elder was equally irregular. As the congregation of Mr. S. adhered to him in his disobedience to Synod, the Presbytery had declared them to be in a state of insubordination, and not entitled to a representation in their meetings. The Synod of 1837, though relieving Mr. Stark from suspension, did nothing to purge the scandal of this disobedience from his congregation. They did not reverse this deed of the Presbytery, nor had the Presbytery reversed it. Even those who admitted Mr. Stark took no notice of it; so that there were two members admitted to seats in direct opposition to acts of the Presbytery excluding them.

When these brethren had by such proceedings strengthened their hands, they felt prepared for the other and more important part of their plot, the exclusion of those who were known to be opposed to Mr. Stark. They had constituted with prayer, attended to the preceding items of business and made a minute of them, all in the space of about ten minutes, when Messrs. Campbell and Martin, ministers, and Mr. Milmine, ruling elder from Florida, came into the house. Mr. Martin says that he examined his watch as soon as he came in, and that it was scarcely ten minutes after the hour at which the Presbytery was to meet; Dr. P. Bullions *supposed* it to have been about fifteen minutes. Dr. P. Bullions, who had been making minutes with a pencil, there being neither pen nor ink in the apartment, now produced a paper written with ink, and prepared, as he was constrained to own, previously to the meeting of the Presbytery. In this paper, Dr. B., who was himself under process, and to be tried at this meeting, contrary to all order came forward as the accuser of his brethren, and moved to exclude from seats Messrs. Martin and Campbell, because, as he alleges, they had "acted in opposition to a decision of Synod, in depriving Mr. Stark and the elder from his congregation of their

seats in Presbytery." It is difficult to account for the inconsistencies of this step in a man not destitute of sense, except on the ground of extreme eagerness to accomplish a purpose. It is not only inconsistent in a member under process to accuse those who are to be his judges, except in the way of objecting to their sitting upon his trial, but still more so to accuse individuals of what was the deed of the court. If there were an offence at all, the court, as such, was the offender; and if the real offender had been named, then the motion of Dr. B. was that the Presbytery should sit in judgment upon itself, and that the criminal should be his own judge and executioner. The Presbytery was called to judge that by their own acts they had forfeited their seats, and so to turn themselves out of doors. But taking the motion as it stands, it proceeds on the supposition that the members of a court may be proceeded against by the court itself, for the votes they have given in answer to its call, according to their judgments, which would be one of the greatest outrages upon liberty. And if that common maul, the "pope," with which all our modern martyrs of discipline assail their "persecutors," had not been so plentifully used of late that it has become in a great measure harmless, we might in our turn take it up, and lay a few blows about the head and shoulders of the above resolution.

Messrs. Martin, Campbell and Milmine endeavored to check these proceedings by protests. This privilege was refused. They endeavored to reason with their brethren, but the liberty of speech without constant interruption could not be obtained. Perceiving that their brethren had plotted against them to exclude them without cause, they chose rather to withdraw and act by themselves. Of this Mr. Martin gave notice, and accordingly he and Messrs. Campbell and Milmine withdrew.—These three, together with an elder from Albany who had not arrived previously to this step, met and constituted in another place. Now the question is which party is entitled to be considered the true Presbytery of Albany. The Synod decided in favor of those who withdrew, and their decision may be justified by the following reasons:

1. The great precipitance with which those who met at the precise time constituted, and proceeded to business. At the most, according to their own admission it was but fifteen minutes after the hour when Messrs. Campbell, Martin and Milmine arrived. As Mr. Martin examined his watch, his statement is entitled to the most credit, that it was scarcely ten minutes. They could hardly have constituted with prayer, and attended to all the business recorded in their minutes, in less than eight or ten minutes. If then they waited at all after the hour, it could not have been over six or seven minutes; the probability is, they did not wait one. If they had not known of other members in the city intending to meet with them, and within a few doors of the place of meeting, their haste had been more excusable. But this excuse they did not and could not plead. Or, again, if the business to be transacted had been of little consequence, or relating to things wherein no disagreement was anticipated, such haste though not courteous to their brethren might not have been regarded as particularly censurable. But neither could this be said in their favor. Measures contemplating the reversal of former deeds of Presbytery, the restoration of an excluded minister to his seat and of a refractory congregation to communion, were of the first importance, and difference of opinion might in any cases of this kind be anticipated; in this instance it was known to exist. What if the Synod had sustained this precipitation in their meeting? Would it not have

been saying to the members of other Presbyteries, "Go and do likewise? If you have any favorite scheme to carry, and fear the opposition of your brethren, you have nothing more to do but to meet at the precise moment, and if your brethren be a few moments later, you can easily carry your measures before their arrival, and if you choose, you may also gather in excluded members, or by other means enlarge your number, so that when your brethren arrive you can exclude them from seats, and shut the door in their faces, saying, we are six against three; we have made up a majority, and must unquestionably be the true Presbytery." It is evident that the approbation of such proceedings would tend to the destruction of all confidence among brethren, and lay a foundation for endless intrigue and confusion.

It is not at all uncommon for members of Presbyteries to wait not only one or two minutes, but quarters of an hour, and sometimes even hours, for the arrival of others who are expected; and to postpone to future meetings business of importance, in consequence of the absence of some member. This is especially done when it is known that the absent members are much interested in any proposed measures, either as advocates or opponents. Every principle of honor and religion commends this course, and condemns the taking advantage of a few moments delay on the part of brethren to carry measures against them, and especially measures tending to their exclusion from the church. Such precipitate meetings may possibly consist with the letter of the law, though we are not sure even of this; but we are sure that they contradict the spirit of the law, and overturn its very foundations.

2. The Synod were justified in their deed on the ground of the illegal admission of Mr. Stark and his elder to seats in the Presbytery. This was the main ground occupied in defence by those who withdrew; and it appeared also to be regarded in the same light by the Synod in their decision. It was pleaded on the floor of Synod, and the argument was not then, and has not since been answered nor even contradicted, that the admission of illegal members vitiates the court admitting them. This principle is extensively, and probably, it is universally acted on in civil proceedings. If one man were allowed to sit on the bench as a judge without legal authority, the whole court would be vitiated, and their deeds made null and void. If one man be admitted into a jury as a member, or even allowed to be present with them without being a qualified juror, the whole jury is vitiated, and their verdict set aside. In an election, where the electors do not hold office, but only stand in a remote relation to it by the choice of others, illegal voters vitiate the election and the officer elected. The same principle has been acted on in ecclesiastical bodies. It was distinctly avowed by the first Seceders, and the violation of it was assigned as a chief ground of their secession. They regarded the judicatories of the Church of Scotland as vitiated, so as no longer to be lawful judicatories of Jesus Christ, because of the intruders or ministers settled by the violence of patronage, who were allowed to occupy seats as members in these courts. They could not regard these men as legal ministers of Christ, and thus pronounced the courts not legal in consequence of their admission. Even in cases where the persons acting are regular office-bearers in the church, but not entitled to seats in that particular court which admits them, the proceedings are vitiated by their votes. Members of sister courts may be invited to sit and deliberate, and may aid their brethren by their counsel, but how could Sessions or Presbyteries be safe, if, at any time, a host of neighboring

ministers and elders might be brought in to vote down the will of the majority? No farther back than the year 1836, the Associate Synod set aside a deed of the Presbytery of Cambridge on this very ground. The following are the words of their act: "*Resolved*, That the proceedings of the Presbytery of Cambridge in this case be set aside, in consequence of their irregularity in admitting a member of another Presbytery to act as a judge, and vote, contrary to the acknowledged rules of Presbyterian Church Discipline." (See *Rel. Mon.* vol. xiii. p. 41.) This decision may be considered as founded on the very definition of a Presbytery, as ordinarily given in books on government and discipline. These books say, that a Presbytery consists of all the pastors within certain bounds, together with a ruling elder from each congregation; and they define the correspondence of Presbyteries by commissioners to each other, as intended for mutual advice. (See *Stewart's Collections*, book 1, title 12, sec. 1 and 8; *Overture of a Book of Discipline of the Associate Church*, chap. 4, sec. 3, &c.) If, then, lawful rulers in the church vitiate the proceedings of courts in which they have no right to act, the same effect must follow from any person's acting who has been unlawfully admitted. And that Mr. Stark and his elder were unlawfully admitted, we think has been made sufficiently evident.*

3. It adds to the weight of this reason that the character of the court was changed by these illegal admissions, so that a majority was gained by those who had been, and would otherwise have still been, a minority. The brethren constituted under Mr. Blair pleaded that they would have had a majority independently of Mr. Stark—there would still have been five of them against the three who withdrew. But it is to be remembered that exception was taken against Mr. Stark's elder on grounds even

* It appears to be taken for granted by Mr. Stark, in the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine*, pp. 21, 22, that Messrs. White, Goodwillie, and Pringle, were illegally excluded from seats in the Presbytery of Cambridge, in the trial of Dr. A. Bullions, and that this illegality was admitted by the Synod. This he supposes occasioned great difficulty and perplexity in connexion with his case; for if the Presbytery of Albany were vitiated by the illegal admission of Mr. S. and his elder, this would go equally to prove that the Presbytery of Cambridge was vitiated by the illegal exclusion of three of their members. This difficulty, however, has no existence except in Mr. Stark's own mind, if it even have existence there. The question about the exclusion of these members did not come before the Synod at all, as those who had protested against it, had fallen from their protests, and were, therefore, to be considered as acquiescing in the decision. Even if the question had come before Synod, there was no evidence produced to show that the Presbytery were not warranted in what they did. Two of these men were excluded because of near relationship, the one being the brother-in-law, and the other the son-in-law of the accused. This is recognised in books of discipline as a warrantable ground of exclusion. *Stewart says*, Book iv., Title 5. Sect. 9, "There is likewise a warrantable declination which may be made against particular members, who are related to the party by consanguinity or affinity, nearer than a cousin-german, or who have behaved themselves as parties in the cause." This rule is not imperative, so that proceedings would be vitiated where no objection was made against such members, but it supposes that relationships may lead to such evidences of partiality that exclusion will be warrantable. In this instance the Presbytery judged that their decision was warranted by both these reasons. As to the other individual excluded, the former of these reasons did not exist. What the judgment of the Synod would have been, if the case had come before them for examination, it is impossible to tell. From the statements incidentally made before them. Some who had no doubt as to the correctness of the Presbytery in excluding the others, expressed doubts as to this step. It may be that a full and fair examination would have removed these doubts; it may be it would have confirmed them. And if this decision of the Presbytery had been brought before the Synod by an appeal, it may be that they would have reversed it; and though the exclusion of this one man did not change the character of the court, if it had been pronounced illegal, it may be that the Synod would, on this ground, have set aside the proceedings of the Presbytery as, on this ground, null and void. It is a hard matter indeed if church courts must not only be reproached for what they do, but for wrong steps which they might have taken, in cases supposed, but never existing.

more clear than against Mr. Stark himself, for nothing had been done either regularly or irregularly to remove the objection against him as belonging to a congregation placed by their own act, and declared by the act of the Presbytery out of the jurisdiction of the church. It is also to be remembered that though only the three had arrived who afterwards withdrew, there was an elder from Mr. Martin's congregation who was on his way to the Presbytery, and who afterwards met with them. The true proposition of members, without those illegally admitted, would have been four against four; and as Mr. Blair was Moderator, there would have been on the floor of Presbytery only three of Mr. Stark's friends against the four who afterwards constituted separately. And besides, as Dr. Bullions was under process for scandal, and to be tried that day, it was not probable that he would have been allowed to take part in any business affecting the standing of other members. It is evident, therefore, that the illegal admissions did change the character of the court, and that if they had waited a few minutes for the arrival of their brethren, they would not have been able to carry their measures.

4. In connexion with the foregoing reasons, another consideration must not be omitted, though it may be regarded rather as an inference from the preceding, than a separate reason: I mean the profane and disorderly character of the proceedings of these brethren. Was it not profanely prostituting the ordinances of prayer, of a solemn constitution as a court in Christ's name and of discipline, to employ them for the purpose of carrying out a measure, which, to say the least of it, and this is what their friends said of it, was full of intrigue. And were not their disorderly proceedings such as might have been anticipated from this profane beginning? If men ask the presence of Christ, and his blessing upon underhand plots; if they seek his Spirit as a Spirit of judgment when they are devising mischief, for what else can we look, but their being left to foolishness and confusion in their counsels?

It was not, perhaps, the mind of some who voted with the majority of Synod in this case, that each one of the foregoing reasons would, by itself, have warranted the decision which was adopted. It was, I think, the opinion of a considerable number, perhaps of most of them, that the Presbytery, though much to be condemned, was not vitiated by their hasty constitution. The majority, however, appeared to be all of one mind as to the court's being vitiated by the above-mentioned illegal admissions. This, therefore, may be regarded as the main ground of defence; the other circumstances noticed, add, however, to the weight of this.

After all, supposing that the decision of the Synod was wrong, it was a mere measure of administration involving no relinquishment or change of our public profession. And what church would not soon be broken into fragments, if all measures of administration supposed to be wrong were resisted and made grounds of secession? At the meeting of Synod, at which it was agreed to review the deed convicting Mr. Stark, many of the members felt deeply aggrieved by what they considered wrong acts of administration. But did they therefore cry out that our profession was abandoned, and popery substituted in its room? Did they put themselves into the attitude of rebellion, and withdraw or threaten to withdraw from the church? Did they say in regard to matters of this description, "We will obey God and not man," and as we consider Mr. Stark restored contrary to the will of God, we cannot sit with him without a renunciation of our principles and our liberty? They adopted no

such divisive measures, and employed no such canting language. If the principle on which these brethren proceed be correct, and every one in matters of discipline and administration is to do that which is right in his own eyes without respect to the decisions of church courts, then these courts might as well be dissolved finally and forever. For to what does all their deliberations and judgments amount, if, after all, every man is to be his own judge in all matters, and to act with as perfect independence as if there were none under God whom he is to obey, and to whom he is to submit himself? If the ground taken by these brethren be not ecclesiastical radicalism, and radicalism run mad, then we have yet to learn what radicalism is. These men were not put on trial for any offence, they were not subjected to any censure, they were not required to own any guilt. They were not so much as required to own that their procedure had either been wrong or irregular. The Synod judged it to be such and if there were sin in this judgment, they took it upon themselves; and did not require them to bear any part of it. On the contrary, the door was expressly opened for them to exonerate themselves by a protest. In this way, they might have vindicated themselves before the church, the world, and their own consciences from all approbation of this deed. But they refused to take this peaceful course. When they could not be sustained in their efforts to exclude their brethren of the Presbytery of Albany, they chose to exclude themselves by withdrawing from the church. The sentence of suspension afterwards past was not for their conduct in the Presbytery, but for their obstinacy and contempt of Synod. Their secession is their own act, and on their own head is the responsibility. It is true that two of the individuals, Dr. P. Bullions and Mr. Stark were under process, and might be afraid that they would fall under the censures of the church; but so far as relates to the decision respecting the party to be recognized as the Presbytery, all that was required of them was to return and act with their brethren as before. To perceive how this could be a giving up of their profession, or involve any matter of principle, requires more penetration than is possessed by

A TRANSYLVANIAN.

Note.—Upon a review of the preceding remarks, I find that in speaking of the minority in the late Synod, they are sometimes called the friends of Mr. Stark and those who took part with him. It is not intended to characterize any as friends or enemies, except in reference to the cause which they advocated or opposed. Mr. Stark labors under a great mistake, if he thinks that the measures of the Synod were the result of any provocation or personal ill will; and under an equally great mistake, if he suppose all those who voted in his favor to be believers in his innocence. On the contrary, if he would now acknowledge himself guilty of the things laid to his charge, it would produce no change of sentiment, except that some might have a more favorable opinion of his honesty.

ART. IV. *Family Government.*—By Dr. HUMPHREV.

(Continued from page 330.)

It has always been a question, how early children become the proper

subjects of parental training, and whether they should be subjected to any kind of authority or restraint, before they are capable of being influenced as moral and accountable agents. That during the first few days of its life, an infant can no more be brought under government, than any of the lower animals, I suppose all will agree; and the decided opinion of some, perhaps of the majority, is, that nothing like discipline should be attempted, till the child is old enough to understand the reason of it. To this opinion, after some experience and the maturest reflection, I cannot subscribe. I regard the question merely as a question of *fact*, and not as involving the accountable agency of the child at all. How early *can* you begin to check its peevishness, and mould its temper to your wishes? If you can safely and with any advantage, begin when the infant is three months or six months old, it is a point of no importance with me how low it is found on the scale of moral agency. As God has nowhere told me, that I must wait till my child can reason and feel itself to blame for crying and showing a bad temper, before I attempt to lay it under any restraint, I consider myself authorized, nay bound, to take it in hand, just as soon as I can bend the twig in a right direction.

Without, therefore, pretending to fix upon the earliest week, or month, I do not hesitate to give it as my opinion, that considerable progress may be made under *six* months, if not under *four*; and that parental authority ought to be well established within the first year and a quarter. It has been done a thousand times, and why should it not be, a thousand more? The best governed children, and will you pardon me if I add, the only well governed children, are those who are brought into complete subjection in the nursery; and most of them at so early a day, that they cannot remember when, half choked by their stubborn wills, they first lipped out, "*I won't*," to try the great question of mastery with their mothers, and were conquered. One thing every body must admit—children are capable of showing, plainly enough, to what race they belong, at a very tender age. It is astonishing to see how early the spirited little fellow will stiffen its body, and throw back its head, and kick and strike, and put forth other demonstrations of its high displeasure: and who can doubt, that when these signs of depravity appear, it is time for the parent to enter on a course of counteraction and repression?

Every nurse must have observed that infants begin to form habits, troublesome or otherwise, almost as soon as they begin to breathe. Lay them quietly down at first, and they will soon become accustomed to it, so as to relieve you of a great deal of care. Rock them to sleep a few times, and you must do it always. Carry them about the room for a single day in your arms, when they are uneasy, and they will find you exercise enough for the rest of the year. Now why should you not take advantage of this extreme ductility, to mould them into all good habits, including the most important of all, a cheerful submission to your authority? As it is easy to accustom children, before they are a year old, to go to bed alone in the dark, and exceedingly delightful to hear them cooing and talking themselves to sleep, so may they unquestionably be brought to yield implicitly to the look and the voice of a parent, at the tenderest age; and when the habit is thus early formed, it saves infinite trouble to both.

Waiving entirely, for the present, the question whether the rod is ever

to be used in the administration of family government, I remark in the first place, that *this government should be uniform.*

This is a point in which a great many worthy heads of families shew their almost utter want of tact and good judgment; and failing here, they succeed but poorly in any of their efforts to establish and maintain the authority which God has made it their duty to exercise over their own household. There is no reason to doubt, that parents of this class love their children as tenderly as any other class; and it is certain, that many of them intend to be conscientious and faithful in the discharge of all their duties. Their theory of government may be perfectly correct, and they begin quite well, perhaps. They bring the child to terms, and make him feel that direct resistance to their will is hopeless and out of the question. But they do not carry an even hand. Now they are strict, even to a fault, and anon they vibrate to the opposite extreme. What they forbid one day, they allow the next. There is no certainty, no uniformity in their administration. Their own temperament is fitful. They are governed more by the east wind, than by a sober judgment. The child, if it does wrong, is in greater danger before dinner than after. He is punished, perhaps, too severely, one hour, and stuffed with cake and sugar plums the next, to square the account.

Now such an administration will never succeed. Children must know what to depend on. You must give them no reason to apprehend too great displeasure on the one hand, nor to hope for extreme lenity on the other. Having settled in your own minds what is right, what obedience your children owe you, and what authority it is your duty to exercise over them, you must hold a steady rein. What you are and what you require to-day, you must be and must require to-morrow. Giving with one hand and taking with the other; doing and undoing; demanding all, and then yielding more than all, is worse than lost labor. No government can be efficient, whether civil or domestic, where there is a great want of uniformity and consistency in the administration.

Secondly: *Family government should be strictly impartial.*

Nothing can be more destructive of domestic harmony than parental favoritism. So long as children of the same family differ essentially in their characters and dispositions, (and this is often the case,) so long as some are gentle, affectionate, and obedient, and others stubborn and unfilial, it is impossible for any parent to regard them alike; and if he could, it would only show his own want of moral discrimination. He must approve and disapprove, reward and punish, with a strict regard to personal character. This is the great principle on which every good government is administered. So far as parental love consists in *complacency* a father may certainly love a dutiful better than an undutiful son. Indeed, he cannot help it, and there is no partiality in this. But if he indulges one child more than another; if he punishes this and lets that go free; if he is blind to the faults of one and severe to mark those of another, he is partial, and can never in this way govern his family well. His children will see and feel the wrong. If those who have reason to complain obey him, it will be from fear and not from affection; and he will be so far from securing the reverence and gratitude of his favorites, that they will be the first to despise his authority and "bring down his gray hairs with sorrow to the grave." If a perverse child will complain, because his privileges are abridged, and he is made to eat the bitter fruits of his own ways, there is no help for it. He might restore himself to the standing and affection which he has forfeited, if he would; and he has

no more right to say, when he is punished and others are rewarded, that injustice is done him, than the thief has to complain, that he is imprisoned while his honest neighbors are unmolested. But while this is true on the one hand, let every parent guard as much as possible against all appearance of partiality on the other; and the moment the prodigal returns, and says, "father, I have sinned," let him be received with open arms, however far he may have wandered, and whatever grief he may have occasioned.

Thirdly: *Family government requires unity of feeling, judgment and action.*

If parents are not of one heart and one mind, in regard to this matter, it will be found extremely difficult, if not impossible, to rule their household well. And how many families suffer from this want of *unity*! The father and mother, instead of "seeing eye to eye," and directing all their efforts to one point, differ essentially, both in theory and practice. As they do not think alike, they move in opposite directions. One parent, perhaps, is too stern, and the other too lax and indulgent. Or if one has correct views of parental authority, and the manner in which it should be exercised, the other looks at the whole subject in a very erroneous point of light. What one regards as a serious fault, the other overlooks as an excusable foible. Where one thinks the rod is called for, the other is entirely opposed to it. Where one is actuated by principle and good judgment, in the painful administration of necessary discipline, the other is swayed by a morbid tenderness, which would screen the little culprit, perhaps to his undoing.

I am aware that a perfect agreement in regard to the most judicious system of family government cannot in all cases be expected. The father and mother may not be able, though they earnestly desire it, to think alike on this subject; nor upon some others, perhaps of great practical moment. This is exceedingly to be regretted. But although you may differ in *judgment*, you may sustain each other in *action*, and you must do it, or your authority is gone. What can the father do, if the mother takes the part of the child? Or what can the mother do, if the father comes in and takes the darling boy out of her hands? Discuss these matters between yourselves as much as you please, but never let your children know or suspect that you are not perfectly agreed. A mother will sometimes think that the father is too severe; and let her convince him of it if she can, as soon as they are alone. A father, in his turn, will sometimes think the mother injudicious; and let him do the same. But never let either interfere at the time. Suppose the most trying case that is likely to happen; suppose the child to be punished a little beyond its demerits; how trifling is the momentary suffering, compared with the mischief which would result from that kind of interference of which I am here speaking! Think alike, if possible. At all events, strengthen each other's hands, and never *seem* to differ. Let your children see, that in the administration of government you are one; that you have one heart and one aim; and that nothing is to be hoped for from any appeal that can be made to either. Take the opposite course; let the jarring of interfering and conflicting action be felt, and your house, being "divided against itself, cannot stand." Your own opinion is, that you better know how to bend the twig than your wife, or your husband, as the case may be. If this be true, render thanks to God for giving you the talent, and make the most of it; but never use it to weaken the authority of

your companion, who, after all, will sometimes be nearer right than yourself.

Fourthly : It is essential to a wise and efficient domestic administration, *that each parent should carry through any course of discipline that he or she undertakes, without any direct assistance from the other.* In almost every such case, either to offer aid or to apply for it, weakens the authority which it is intended to strengthen. Whenever a father undertakes to subdue a perverse child, he must do it effectually without looking any where but to God for help, and without accepting it, should it be ever so kindly offered. If the boy sees that he needs or receives any extraneous aid, his authority is weakened. In like manner, whenever the mother commands, she must be obeyed; and if there is any resistance, she must be left to overcome it by herself, especially in the nursery. The father may be convinced that he could accomplish the object sooner than the mother, and may wish to relieve her from the painful struggle in which he sees her engaged, but it will never do. What she has begun, she must finish. The child must yield, and must yield to her, and not to somebody else. She may regret that she did not leave the task to stronger nerves; but there is no retreat. She must carry her point, or her authority will be despised. Every thing of this sort, no doubt, ought to be well considered, and as far as practicable, agreed upon beforehand; and if an older child requires discipline, the father ought in most cases to undertake it. But the point on which I insist is, that what either parent actually undertakes, must be finished without any immediate and obvious help from the other.

Fifthly : *That in the government of a family, every thing depends upon a good beginning.* If you fail here, very faint is the prospect that you will ever succeed. If your child is not well trained, and brought under entire subjection to your authority, you will find it extremely difficult to rule your household well afterwards. What can you do with the younger children, how can you expect they will reverence and obey you, when they have the example of headiness and insubordination in an older brother, constantly before their eyes? As 'one sinner destroyeth much good' in a community, so does one ungoverned child in a family; and, above all, if he be the *eldest*. It would be next to a miracle, if his example did not prove a permanent source of contagion.

On the other hand, if you succeed happily in the management of your first-born; if he is docile, obedient, and affectionate from the cradle, he will help you exceedingly, by the influence of his example upon the minds, tempers and habits of his younger brothers and sisters. The principle or instinct of imitation, as every one knows, is much stronger in early childhood than at any other period of life; and no where is it so strong as in the domestic circle. It is the electrical wire, which the eldest holds in his hand, and by which he communicates the spark to all the rest at pleasure. If, by the blessing of God, you succeed well in your first endeavors; if the early establishment of your authority is unquestionable and unquestioned by your own fireside; the prospect is fair, that with comparatively little trouble, you will secure the cheerful obedience of all your children; but if you stumble at the threshold, you can scarcely expect ever to recover from the shock. If you cannot mould the temper and habits of *one* child to your wishes, how can you manage *several*, under all the disadvantages, arising from his bad example.

But perhaps your first-born is your *only* child; and if so, you will need

to be especially on your guard against the undue ascendancy of those parental yearnings, which bind it so closely to your hearts. It is a common remark, founded on observation and experience, that an only son or daughter is in great danger of suffering by too much indulgence, if not of being spoiled; and quite certain I am, that it requires more self-denial to thwart the wishes and curb the temper of an only child, than it would if he were but one of a numerous family. If you do not watch and pray without ceasing, the dear little creature, upon whom your fondest hopes and affections are concentrated, will take undue liberties; and in one way or another, make dangerous encroachments upon that authority with which God had clothed you, and for the proper exercise of which he holds you accountable. Depend upon it, if you yield to the importunities of your son, or spare him when he does wrong, because you have but *one* and cannot bear to deny or chastise him, he is getting the mastery of you, to your certain retribution for unfaithfulness, and probably to his own undoing. Say not then, he is my *all*, and therefore I cannot deny him, I cannot be severe in marking his faults; but rather say, that *as* he is my all, it becomes me to be the more exact and faithful in the discharge of all my parental duties.

Sixthly: *The rights and duties of parents, in this regard, extend through the whole period of the child's minority.* It is not enough for parents to bring their children early under proper subjection, and then leave their authority to take care of itself. There is no such executive energy in any domestic code, however wise or reasonable. The work is only commenced, when you have subdued the refractory spirit of your child. It is indeed an auspicious beginning; and if you keep the advantage which you have gained, the task will ever be comparatively easy. But you must never let go the reins. If you relax, if you leave the child after it has once yielded, to follow its own depraved inclinations, it will soon become as headstrong as ever; and if it does not get entirely beyond your reach, it may cost you infinite trouble to regain the ground which you have lost. All the natural tendencies in the minds of our children are downward; and there is no overcoming this gravitating power, but by constant effort. "Line must be upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little."

A judicious parent will not use exactly the same means to govern a boy of eight years old, as he does to govern a child of two; nor will he deal with a grown up son of fifteen, just as he does with a lad of ten. But though the *means* will be different, the *end* is the same. The young man of twenty, in his father's house, has no more right to say that he will use his own discretion, in regard to observing the rules and regulations of the family, than a child of ten; and that parent sins against God, against the community in which he lives, and against his own family, who throws up his authority, before his children can safely be left to govern and take care of themselves. What a heavenly example has Jesus Christ left, for the imitation of all children, down to the end of the world. When, after three days anxious search, his parents "found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions," what did he do? Did he decline going home and being any longer under their control? No. "He went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was *subject* unto them." Let every son of twelve years old, who begins to feel restive under parental authority, and most undutifully to hanker after independence in his father's house, turn to Luke *second*, and read from the *forty-first* verse to

the end of the chapter, and blush to think of the contrast between his undutifulness, and the filial obedience of the Saviour of the world!

Seventhly: *Family government, to be well and successfully administered, must be absolute.* Gentle reader, startle not at this proposition, as some autocratical ukase in the empire of education. Pronounce it not false and dangerous, till you have taken time to think of it, and candidly to weigh the few thoughts which I have to suggest in its defence. I am sensible, that nothing in the English vocabulary grates so harshly upon republican ears, as the word *absolute*. To talk of an absolute government any where, within the protection of our stars and stripes, is calculated to stir up the spirit of *seventy-six* from ocean to ocean; and to call forth a voice of denunciation louder than "seven thunders." But hear me patiently, and then judge.

Is an absolute government *necessarily* despotic and oppressive? What will you then say of the highest and most perfect government in the universe? Does not the great Father of the whole human family govern it with a perfect sway? Can any one stay his hand or resist his will? The objection, therefore, lies not against this form of government, but against the almost certain *mal-administration* of it, in the hands of any earthly ruler. In an absolute monarchy, the will of the sovereign is the supreme law of the land. All power, legislative, judicial and executive, is vested in him. If he abuses it, he is a tyrant. If he wields it to oppress the people he is a despot. But he is not obliged to be a despot because he is absolute. He might reign in righteousness, and in all his measures have a supreme regard to the happiness of his subjects; and if such a ruler could be found, endowed with wisdom, too, equal to his virtue, we might expect that his reign would be pre-eminently beneficent and prosperous. But this there seems to be no reason to look for, till "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Any government is absolute, where the will of the head is the supreme law; or, in other words, where there are no co-ordinate powers to modify and control it. And this is what I mean, when I say that family government is absolute—not *tyrannical*, not *despotic*—as far from it as possible;—but *supreme*. A patriarchal government cannot be otherwise. The moment you modify it, in any way, it ceases to be patriarchal. Every parent must make the laws in his own little empire, and must see that they are obeyed. This, as I remarked in a former paper, is the divine institution. Parents are placed at the head of their respective families to *govern*, as well as to *teach* their children, and how could they govern according to their best judgment, and the dictates of their consciences, if the power was partly in other hands? In what other hands could it be safely placed? Would it do to bring in the children themselves legislators, and leave it with them to decide, what laws they would or would not sanction by their co-ordinate vote? Could it be done by a general confederation of heads of families, within certain limits? Could parents make the laws and then refer them, for approval, to the legislative authorities of the state? I need not say a word to show, that either of these expedients would be ruinous. And then, if the administration of family government is not absolute and final, how can the authority of parents be sustained for an hour? The right of appeal supposes that there is some higher power to review and reverse their decisions. Where could such a power safely be lodged? What an anomaly would it be in human jurisprudence, to see children bringing their fathers and

mothers by regular process before the tribunals! But I will not enlarge. In the very nature of the case, the parental prerogative must be supreme, or family government cannot be maintained. How it ought to be exercised is quite another thing; and it is a question of vital importance, which I propose to consider in its proper place. But I feel well assured, that no other form of domestic government can ever succeed. In the wide range of national rule, supreme power in the hands of one individual is not necessary—is not safe; but every man must rule his own house, according to his best light and judgment. His children must feel that he has a right to decide in all cases; and that his will is to govern, unless it plainly contravenes some paramount moral obligation, and thus encroaches upon the sacred rights of conscience.

[To be continued]

ART. V. *Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices.*

(Continued from page 279.)

[Omitting Parts III and IV, we shall only republish, in two brief insertions, the Author's "APPENDIX, touching four more of Satan's Devices; whereby he prevents poor souls from receiving and embracing the Lord Jesus, and from relying upon him only for everlasting happiness, according to the gospel; and remedies against these devices."]

CHAP. I. *His first device to keep the soul from believing in Christ, is,* By suggesting to him the greatness and vileness of his sins. What, saith Satan, dost thou think that thou shalt ever obtain mercy by Christ, who have sinned with so high a hand against him? Thou hast slighted the tenders of grace, grieved the Spirit, and despised the word of God; and hast spoken and done all the evil that thou couldst. (Jer. iii. 5.) No, no, saith Satan, he hath mercy, pardon, and righteousness for others, but not for thee, &c. Now the remedies against this device are these;

Remedy 1. Consider, that the greater your sins, the more you stand in need of a Saviour: the heavier your burden, the more you stand in need of one to help to bear it: the deeper the wound, the more need is there of the surgeon: the more dangerous the disease is, the more need of the physician. Who but madmen will argue thus? My burden is great, therefore, I will not call for help; my wound is deep, therefore, I will not call for balm; my disease is dangerous, therefore I will not go to the physician. Ah! it is spiritual madness, it is the devil's logic, to argue thus: 'My sins are great, therefore, I will not go to Christ, I dare not rest nor lean on Christ,' &c. whereas the soul should reason thus: 'The greater my sins are, the more I stand in need of mercy, of pardon: and, therefore, I will go to Christ, who delights in mercy, who pardons sins for his own name's sake.' (Micah vii. 18. Is. xliii. 25.)

Rem. 2. Remember, that the promise of grace and mercy, is to returning souls. And, therefore, though you may have been never so wicked, yet if thou wilt return, God, and mercy, and pardon shall be thine. (2 Chron. xxx. 9. Jer. iii. 13.) 'Go, and proclaim these words'—(Joel iii. 13.) 'And rend your hearts, and not your garments,'—(Is. lv. 7.) 'Let the wicked forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon:' or as the Hebrew reads it, 'He will multiply pardons.' (So Ezek. xviii.)

Sinner! it is not thy great transgressions that can exclude thee from mercy; if thou wilt break off thy sins by repentance, and return to the fountain of mercy. The heart and arms of Christ are wide open to embrace the returning prodigal. It is not simply the greatness of your sins, but your obstinately persisting in sin, that will be your eternal overthrow.

Rem. 3. Solemnly consider, that the greatest sinners have obtained mercy; and therefore all the angels in heaven, all the men on earth, and all the devils in hell, cannot tell to the contrary, but that thou mayest obtain mercy. Manasseh was a notorious sinner, he made Judah to sin more wickedly than the heathen did, whom the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel, and caused the streets of Jerusalem to run down with innocent blood.* What a devil incarnate did he appear to be in these proceedings? Yet when he humbled himself, and sought the Lord, the Lord was intreated of him, and heard his supplication, and brought him to Jerusalem, and made himself known unto him, and crowned him with mercy and loving kindness, as you may see in (2 Chron. xxxiii.) So Paul was once a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious, yet he obtained mercy. (1 Tim. i. 13.) Mary Magdalene also, was a notorious strumpet, one out of whom Christ cast seven devils yet she is pardoned and dearly beloved of Christ. (Luke vii. Mark xvi. 9.)

Bodin hath a story concerning a great rebel who had made a strong party against a Roman emperor. The emperor made proclamation, that whoever should bring the rebel, dead or alive, should have a great sum of money. The rebel hearing of this, came and presented himself before the emperor, and demanded the money. 'Now, (said the emperor) if I put him to death, the world will say, I did it to save my money.' And so he pardoned the rebel, and gave him the money.

Oh sinners! shall a heathen do this, who had but a drop of Mercy and compassion in him? And will not Christ do much more, who hath all fulness of grace, mercy, and glory in himself? Surely his bowels do yearn toward the worst of rebels. Oh! if you do but come in, you will find him ready to pardon, yea, one made up of pardoning mercy. Oh! the readiness and willingness of Jesus Christ to receive to favour the greatest rebels.†

Sinners! if these bowels of mercy do not melt, win, and draw you, the justice of God will be a swift witness against you; you will lie down in eternal misery, for kicking against these bowels of mercy. Christ hangs out still, as once that warlike Schythian did, a white flag of grace and mercy to returning sinners, who humble themselves at his feet for favor; but if they shall stand out, he will put forth his red, his bloody flag, and they shall die for ever by a hand of justice. Sinners, there is no way to avoid perishing by Christ's iron rod, but by kissing his golden sceptre!

Rem. 4. Consider, that Jesus Christ hath no where in all the scripture excepted against the worst of sinners, that are willing to receive him, to believe in him, to rest upon him, for happiness and blessedness. Ah sinners! why should you be more cruel and unmerciful to your own souls, than Christ is? Christ hath not excluded you from mercy, why then should you exclude your own souls? Oh, that you would

* The Hebrew doctors write, that he slew Isaiah the prophet, who was his father-in-law.
† Col. i. 19. ii. 3, 4. Neh. ix. 17. Heb. But thou a God of pardons.

dwell often upon that choice scripture, (John vi. 37.) 'All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me, and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out;' or as the original hath it, 'I will not cast out.' (1 Cor. vi. 9—11.)

'Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever,' (Heb. xiii. 8.) He was born in an inn, to shew that he receives all comers; his garments were divided into four parts, to shew that out of what part of the world soever we come, we shall be received. If we are naked, Christ hath robes to clothe us; if strangers, Christ hath room to lodge us. That is a choice scripture, (Acts x. 34, 35.) 'Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons. But in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.'

Rem. 5. Consider, that the greater sinner thou art, the greater honour thou wilt be to Christ, when he shall behold thee as the travail of his soul, (Is. liii. 11.) 'He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied.' The more we pay for any thing, the dearer that thing is to us. Christ hath paid most, prayed most, sighed most, wept and bled most, for the greatest sinners, and therefore they are dearer to Christ than others that are less sinful; Rachel was dearer to Jacob than Leah, because she cost him more; he obeyed, endured, and suffered more by day and night for her, than for Leah. (Gen. xxix. 30.) Ah sinners! the greatness of your sins does but set off the fulness and riches of Christ's grace, and the freeness of his love.

Rem. 6. Seriously consider, that the longer you keep from Christ, the greater and stronger your sins will grow. All Divine power and strength against sin, is derived by the soul's union and communion with Christ. (Rom. viii. 10. 1 John i. 6, 7.) While you keep at a distance from Christ, you keep from that power which only is able to make you sufficient to trample down strength, lead captivity captive, and slay the Goliaths that bid defiance to Christ. It is only faith in Christ that gives a man victory over sin, Satan, hell, and the world. (1 John v. 4.) It is only faith in Christ that binds the strong man hand and foot, cures every spiritual disease, and makes a man strong in resisting, and happy in conquering. Sin is always weakest where faith is strongest; the most faithful soul, is the most mortified soul. Sinner, remember this, there is no way on earth effectually to be rid of the guilt, filth, and power of sin, but by believing in a Saviour. It is not resolving, nor complaining; it is not mourning, but believing, that will make you divinely victorious, over that body of sin that is too strong for you, and that will certainly be your ruin, if not ruined by the hand of faith.

Rem. 7. Wisely consider, that as there is *nothing* in Christ to discourage the greatest sinners from believing in him, so there is *every thing* in Christ that may encourage them to believe in him, to rest and lean upon him, for all happiness and blessedness. (Cant. i. 3.) If you look upon his nature, his disposition, his names, his titles, his offices, as King, Priest, and Prophet, you will find nothing to discourage the greatest sinners from believing in him, but many things to encourage them to receive him, to believe on him. (Col. i. 19. ii. 3. Cant. v. 10.) Christ is the greatest, the most suitable, and necessary good: he is a real, an eternal, and a soul-satisfying good. Sinners, are you poor? Christ hath gold to enrich you: are you naked? He hath royal robes of righteousness to clothe you: Are you blind? He hath eye-salve to enlighten you: are you hungry? He will be manna to feed you: are

you thirsty? He will be a well of living water to refresh you: are you wounded? He hath a balm under his wings to heal you: are you sick? He is a physician to cure you: are you prisoners? He hath paid down a ransom for you. O then believe in him, and then, 'Though your sins be as scarlet; they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.' Nay, your iniquities shall be forgotten, as well as forgiven; they shall be remembered no more: God will cast them behind his back, he will cast them into the depths of the sea. (Is. i. 18. xliii. 25. xxxviii. 17. Micah. i. 19.)

Rem. 8. Seriously consider the absolute necessity of believing in Christ. 'The fearful and unbelieving, &c. shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. If ye believe not that I am he (saith Christ) ye shall die in your sins.' (John viii. 24.) And he that dies in his sins, must come to judgment, and depart to hell in his sins. Every unbeliever is a condemned man. 'He that believeth not (saith John) is condemned' ALREADY. (John iii. 18. 36.) Sinners! the law, the gospel, and your own consciences, have past the sentence of condemnation upon you, and there is no way to escape the sentence, but by believing in Christ: and therefore my counsel is this: Stir up yourselves to lay hold on the Lord Jesus, and look up to him, and wait on him, from whom every good and perfect gift comes, and give him no rest till he hath given thee that jewel FAITH, which is more worth than heaven and earth, and which will make thee happy in life, joyful in death, and glorious in the day of Christ. (Is. lxiv. 7. James i. 17. Is. lxii. 7.)

CHAPTER II.—*The second Device that Satan hath to keep poor sinners from believing in, and closing with a Saviour, is, By suggesting to them their unworthiness. Ah saith Satan! As thou art worthy of the greatest misery, so thou art unworthy of the least crumb of mercy. Dost thou think, saith Satan, that ever Christ will own, receive, or embrace such an unworthy wretch as thou art? No, no, if there were any worthiness in thee, then indeed Christ might be willing to be entertained by thee. Thou art unworthy to receive Christ into thy house, how much more unworthy art thou to entertain Christ in thy heart?—Now the remedies against this device are these:*

Remedy. 1. Against this device of Satan, seriously consider, that God hath no where in the scripture required any worthiness in the creature before believing in Christ. If you make a diligent search through all the scripture, you shall not find one word that represents God, as requiring any worthiness in the creature, before the soul believes and rests upon Christ for happiness and blessedness; and why then should that be an hindrance to thy faith, which God doth no where require of thee before thou comest to Christ, that thou mayest have life? Ah, sinners! remember, Satan objects your unworthiness against you, only for a design to keep Christ and your souls asunder for ever, and therefore, in the face of all your unworthiness, rest upon Christ, come to him, and believe in him, and you are happy for ever. (John vi. 40, 47.)

Rem. 2. Wisely consider, that none did receive and embrace Christ, and obtain mercy and pardon from him, but such as felt themselves unworthy. Pray what worthiness was there in Matthew, Zaccheus, Manasseh, Paul, and Lydia, before their coming to Christ, or before their faith in Christ? Surely none. Ah sinners! you should reason

thus : Christ hath bestowed the choicest mercies, the greatest favours, the highest dignities, the sweetest privileges, upon unworthy sinners ; and therefore, O our souls, do not faint, do not despair ; but patiently and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord.

Rem. 3. Consider, that if the soul will keep from Christ till it be worthy, it will never come to him ; it will never embrace, nor be one with Christ, and so it must lie down in everlasting sorrow. (Is. l. 11.) God hath laid up all worthiness in Christ, that the creature may know where to find it, and seek after it. There is no way on earth for unworthy souls to become worthy, but by believing in Christ : believing in Christ will make slaves become worthy sons ; enemies, worthy friends. God calls none worthy, nor carries it towards any as worthy, but believers, who are made worthy by the worthiness of Christ's person, righteousness, satisfaction, and intercession, &c. (John i. 12. James ii. 12. Rev. iii. 4.)

Rem. 4. Solemnly consider, that if you make a diligent search into your own hearts, you will find that it is the pride and folly of them that inclines you to bring worthiness to Christ. You would fain bring something to Christ that might render you acceptable to him, you are loth to come empty handed. The Lord cries out, (Is. lv. 1, 2.) 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money, come ye.' Here the Lord calls upon penny-less, unworthy souls, to come and partake of his precious favors freely. But sinners are proud and foolish, and because they have no money, no worthiness to bring, they will not come though he freely invite them. Ah sinners ! what is more just than that you should perish for ever, who prefer husks among swine, before the milk and wine, the sweet and precious things of the gospel, that are so freely held forth to you, &c. Well, sinners, remember this, it is not so much the sense of your unworthiness, as your pride, that keeps you from embracing the Lord Jesus, as your Saviour.

(To be continued.)

ART. VI. *Eight Reasons against Universalism.*—By DR. ALEXANDER.

1. It does violence to the Holy Scriptures, and perverts the plain and obvious meaning of numerous passages which speak of the future punishment of impenitent sinners. And if in one case we may thus set aside the express and repeated declarations of God, to accommodate the doctrines to our own reason or inclinations, the volume of inspiration is dishonored and rendered useless, for upon these principles we may reject every fundamental truth of the Bible. If the doctrine of future punishment is not taught in the Bible, neither is the doctrine of future happiness ; for they are commonly inculcated in the same passages, and in similar language.

2. If it be true that sin is not punished in the future world, then it would follow that God exercises no moral government over the world ; for in the present life the wicked often live at ease and are prosperous and the virtuous are afflicted. This doctrine goes far to annihilate all difference between virtue and vice ; for we must judge of these according to the treatment they respectively receive from the Supreme Ruler ; but if there be no future punishment, there is no strong mark of disapprobation set on vice.—A doctrine which involves such a consequence as this, must be false and dangerous.

3. If this doctrine should become general, *human society could not exist*. Like atheism to which it is near akin, its malignant tendency is not fully seen, while society at large is under the influence of a contrary belief. But take away from all men the fear of judgment and eternity, and this world becomes a scene of violence—an aceldama. All confidence among men would be destroyed; all the bonds of civil society would be severed. Do not say that vice might be coerced by the civil law—a vain hope. Where the whole mass are corrupt, laws are useless. What means of ascertaining the truth in courts of justice will remain, without which justice cannot be administered, if no man fears the consequences of perjury? Suppose a man who has no fear of judgment, to be solemnly called upon to declare the truth in a case where his own honor and interest, or that of some friend, is at stake—what is there to prevent him from perjuring himself? Or if he can gratify secret malice, by swearing against the life of an enemy, what shall restrain him? He may reason with himself thus: “I know this is a wicked act, but it will serve my purpose, it will enable me to gratify my revenge; and I have nothing to fear. Detection here is impossible, and hereafter I am sure of heaven, do as I will.” What security should we have that our food and medicine would not be mingled with poison in every house? The men who propagate such doctrines are manifestly pursuing a course destructive to the peace and good order of society. I would fully as soon have an Atheist to bear witness against me on oath, or to sit in judgment as a juror, as one of these new fangled Universalists.

4. If there is no future punishment, the wicked who are driven away in their wickedness are happier than the righteous who are preserved to suffer. The wicked antediluvians who perished in the flood, had a better portion and a richer reward than Noah, for they all escaped the troubles of life and went to heaven, while Noah and his family were subjected to innumerable hardships for some hundreds of years. The inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah were better off, though they were destroyed by fire from heaven, than righteous Lot, who escaped; for they were released at once from all pain and sorrow, but his afflictions were many. The wicked Cananites were too bad to live upon earth, and therefore God enjoined it on Joshua to extirpate them: but not too bad to be admitted at once to heaven without any repentance or sanctification. Their lot was, therefore, greatly preferable to that of the Israelites, who endured many toils and sufferings. Upon this theory Judas was rather benefitted than injured by his base and ungrateful crime of betraying his Lord, and by his suicide. Indeed if there be no future punishment, and the next world be better than this, not only will suicide be innocent and beneficial, but there can be no great harm in murder. It only ushers a fellow creature into superior bliss a little earlier than if he were left to die a natural death.

5. Upon the supposition that this doctrine is true, repentance is useless; neither is their any need of sanctification. Heaven is the sinner's right without any condition or preparation. How the ungodly will be pleased with the place and its exercises, is another question. Whether dying will take away their disrelish for devotional exercises is not explained. But there is no need of undergoing the sorrows of repentance for sin.—This the Universalists acknowledge. A writer before referred to, declares, “that there is not the least occasion for solicitude about salvation, neither is it in our power to promote or hin-

der it." We did suppose that the advocates of this doctrine would have pleaded for repentance, which is nothing else but a turning from sin to God, as useful to prevent evil in this life; but we find that in this we mistook their views, for the same writer asserts, concerning the evils that sin produces here, "that these consequences are inevitable and cannot be escaped, even by repentance." What these men can preach, or why they should at all, we do not see.

6. Upon this theory there is no need of religion of any kind; no connection exists between religion and salvation; between the man who loves and serves God, and him who hates him and despises his service. Atheism is as good as piety, idolatry and heresy as safe a way to heaven as truth and righteousness. The one thing needful is, to be fully persuaded that nothing is needful. If men are only informed that there will be no future reckoning, no condemnation of the wicked, no future punishment, they need know nothing else; and whether they believe it or not, all are in a safe way to heaven. We presume that the principal preaching of Universalists is on the single point, that the wicked have nothing to fear on account of their sins: for why should they disturb their hearers about believing or doing other things? But the benefits of this system will, in the future world be as fully enjoyed by those who oppose the doctrine, as by those who believe and preach it.

7. This doctrine encourages men to continue in sin, by removing all fear of future judgment and punishment. In this respect its tendency is as bad as atheism itself; for the most impious denial of a Divine Being cannot promise more to its foolish votaries than exemption from judgment and future punishment. This species of Universalism is fraught with the very worst poison of atheism. It tells the sinner that let him act as wickedly as he will, or as he can, there is no fear of future misery. Indeed, it is in some respects worse than atheism, for it not only promises exemption from punishment, but the reward of eternal happiness to the impenitent sinner. It says to the atrocious murderer and cruel assassin, "You need fear no evil hereafter; though you should die in the commission of the foulest deeds heaven with all its glory and happiness, is yours." Is not this shocking to every honest mind? and what must the effect be on profane, cruel, and abandoned profligates? How pernicious its influence in the hour of temptation! Suppose an inexperienced youth in a place of trust to have imbibed this doctrine. An opportunity occurs of defrauding his employer of a vast sum of money, with the prospect of escaping detection. Well, what shall hinder him from enriching himself at once? If the belief of a future judgment were now to rise in his mind, he would be ready, like Joseph, to say, "*How can I do this great evil and sin against God.*" But having no apprehension of any judgment to come, and sure of heaven let him do what he will, he is led into temptation and is deprived of every consideration which would lead him to resist it. Even the faint hope that there is no future punishment, has a powerful effect in leading corrupt men to commit atrocious crimes although this hope is contrary to all that they have ever been taught; but who can calculate the influence of a persuasion that there is no future punishment for the greatest crimes, derived from men who pretend to be preachers of the gospel? Doubtless a large portion of the most abominable crimes that ever were perpetrated, owe their existence to a secret belief or hope of the truth of the very doctrine which Universalists preach.

8. It is a horrible consequence of this doctrine, that it puts it in the power of the sinner to *set God himself at defiance with impunity*. The malignant, ungrateful wretch, instead of praising, may blaspheme the great Jehovah every day of his life, and may die with horrid blasphemies on his lips, and yet he shall be rewarded with everlasting happiness! Indeed as all the punishment of sin is supposed to be in this life, when a sinner commits some horrible crime in the last moment of his life, as in a late case where a man first shot an innocent person and then blew out his own brains, where or how will he receive his due punishment? His death is but the pang of a moment, and if there be no retribution for such crimes in the government of God, it cannot be believed that he is a righteous moral Governor.

ART. VII.* *Poetry—Adrian.*

(For the Religious Monitor.)

Adrian, a Romam Emperor, who was born at Rome A. D. 76, ascended the imperial throne in 117, and died at Bajæ A. D. 138 in the 63d year of his age, and who, with many good qualities, was guilty of great licentiousness and many faults;—Composed, while on his death-bed, the following lines:

Animula, vagula, blandula,
Hospes, comesque corporis,
Quæ nunc abibis in loca
Pallidula, rigida, nudula
Nec, ut soles, dabit jacos.

The following verses were founded on the expression—"Quæ nunc abibis in loca"?—as addressed to his soul:—"where now, and in what place, will be your home"?

My soul on the wing, and death drawing near,
My throne and my crown to change for the bier
To stain all my glory, and tread it to dust:
How vain all my triumphs—how foolish my trust!

Kingdoms I've conquer'd; the world owns my sway,
Nations my mandates with reverence obey;
But now on my couch of anguish and pain,
Blest health, I cannot command back again.

Death laughs to scorn my titles and name;
The dust of the grave will soon cover my fame:
Mighty Adrian soon buried forgotten will lie;
Mighty Adrian! O mockery! I must die—I must die.

O death—hateful death—with thy shroud, and thy grave,
Wilt thou cover the monarch as well as the slave?
Through thy gates must all enter—the high and the low,
Born, but to perish at last by thy blow.

O death—hateful death—with thy herald disease,
Come to blast all my hopes, and my soul's life to seize,

From friends, and from pleasures, to bear me away,
And hide in the darkness my mouldering clay!

You shall not yet slay me :—hasten and bring
Astrologers, Diviners to rescue their King;
Go; Search the stars, and their influence *command*
To save me from death, and its dread power withstand.

Vain hope! they cannot save themselves :—O Death
To this thy touch arrests my laboring breath :
Can nothing save me, and thy power control?
I die, I die, and whither goes my soul?

No jesting in Eternity : Can it be so
As these despised Christians tell; that wo—
Eternal wo will follow sin: and wrath—
Unmingl'd wrath, for guilt, will follow death?

Dread thought! the damps of death is on my brow :
My soul—my soul—*where* will your home be now
If *this* be true, no refuge from the storm
For thee—the prey of the undying fire and worm.

I die, I die; I feel death's torturing dart
Entering my viens, and piercing through my heart :
I'm sinking: save me—*save me*—and the whole
Of my broad Empire's yours :—My soul—My soul!

Look from that palace, and that bed of down,
To you poor hovel; none of earth's renown
Surrounds that sufferer: no menials watch his nod,
But angels guard him, as the friend of God.

He too is dying; yet, no terrors melt
His soul with anguish, though his heart has felt
The grasp of death: in that appalling hour,
He meets its stroke, as God's commission'd power.

Redeem'd by blood, even death he cannot fear,
In death, he sees his best friend drawing near,
To bear him, where, while endless ages roll,
Eternal happiness shall bless the soul.

His soul's *Home* is prepar'd; unlike that King,
In triumph he can shout: "Death where's thy sting?"
My Saviour died to save, in conquering thee;
The soul is sate—"O grave, where now's thy victory?"

Give me through life, the Christian's rugged path,
His happy death—his soul secur'd from wrath;
And take earth's treasures: to my soul be given
Blest with the Saviour's love, a home in Heaven.

MAXTON.

ART. VIII. *Excommunication of the Burghers.—A Mistake corrected.*

MR. EDITOR—In an article in the Associate Presbyterian Magazine, bearing the signature, *Andrew Stark*, I perceive, that the "Appendix" to the "Narrative" lately published by a committee of the Presbytery of Cambridge is *erroneously* ascribed to that committee. Whether this was done designedly, or not, I do not undertake to say. The "Narrative" published by the committee bears their signature. The "Appendix" is without any signature, and was not published by the committee, but by an individual on his own responsibility. This statement is due to the committee.

Now, as to the matter on which the writer in the Magazine displays the peculiarities of his intellect, let us see, without any *quibbling* or *sophistication*, where the truth lies. It seems, Mr. Stalker had published in a pamphlet, that "The General Associate Synod excommunicated the Associate Synod;" or in more common phrase, that, the Anti-Burgher Synod excommunicated the Burgher Synod. Mr. Stalker is evidently speaking of these bodies as *Synods*, and not of the *individuals* composing them. For he says, "as the latter," nearly a century afterwards, "did not ask the sentence to be removed, they virtually assented to the justice of it." He cannot therefore be speaking of "excommunicated" *individuals*, for they had long before that time given in their "final account," but of an "excommunicated" *Synod*, which still survived at the time of the union of which he is speaking. The question then is, Did the Anti-Burgher Synod, as Mr. Stalker affirms, excommunicate the Burgher *Synod*? Unless this be true, his argument falls to the ground. The writer however of the "Appendix" denies this, and proceeds to show the falsity of Mr. Stalker's *premises*. He gives the only *act* of the Anti-Burgher Synod which related to the Burgher Synod, as a *judicatory*, as a *Synod*; which *act* in "the language of ecclesiastical discipline" is not as he says, called an act of "excommunication." With this act, the writer of the "Appendix" stops; as it was sufficient to overthrow the statement of Mr. Stalker. He might however, have proceeded further and stated, that some two years afterwards the said Synod did inflict the censure of excommunication on certain *individual ministers* belonging to the Burgher Synod after a regular process by libel, citation, &c. but not on *all* the members composing that judicatory. The Burgher Synod therefore as a *Synod* was never excommunicated, neither were all its component members in their individual capacity. But on the other hand, as the writer of the "Appendix" shows, the Burgher Synod did pass a sentence not merely of *excommunication* but of *annihilation* upon the Anti-Burgher Synod *as such*. The writer of the article in the Magazine surely must have known all this, but if not, as we understand he wishes to pass for a *gentleman*, we doubt not, he will make the *amende honorable*.

FAIR PLAY.

P.S. If Mr. Stark be what he professes, he will retract the following unjust reflection made in the same article:—"I have no disposition to retaliation on Messrs. Anderson, Miller and Gordon, by reproaching them with the failure of their memories.—People's memories need not be blamed with forgetting what they never knew. It is a pity that ministers could not be taught the history of their own church, *at least*, before they should be ordained to teach others. This would help to keep

them from exposing themselves;" and also the statement made in a *note* respecting one of the "Synod's messengers;" as we know it to be entirely destitute of all color of truth.

F. P.

ART. IX. *A Pro-Slavery Argument considered.*

MR. EDITOR—David Meredith Reese, M. D. author of a late work, entitled "Humbugs of New York," has undertaken to prove from the Bible the lawfulness of Slavery. The following is a sample of his logic:—"God has not only permitted it [Slavery] but has legislated for its perpetuity.—The rights of the master or owner of slave property are acknowledge by the divine law. Nor do we need any other proof than the tenth commandment of the Decalogue, which is of universal and perpetual obligation; for there we read—'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's *man*-servant, nor thy neighbor's *maid*-servant, nor any thing that is *his*;' and surely no one need to be informed that the word *his*, when the ellipsis is filled up, means his *property*; for it cannot possibly mean any thing else." (P. 147—8)

Truly this author is a very Nicodemus indeed, and understands the divine law or scripture doctrine about as well as his prototype did the subject of the *new birth*, when he exclaimed, "How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" Christ's doctrine was a *puzzler* to Nicodemus, and it would seem, that the Doctor of "Humbugs" has got into the same fog, in attempting to prove the lawfulness of slavery from the divine law, and referring to the Tenth Commandment for proof. Is it not evident to all, who have been savingly taught by the Spirit of God, that such a man, though pretending to teach others, "needs himself to be taught, what be the first principles of the oracles of God?"

Now if we admit that the Doctor has proved from the Tenth Commandment the "right of property in man," the right to buy and sell, and own as property, *man-servants* and *maid-servants*, we can prove from the same commandment that a man has the same right of property precisely in his *wife*, his partner, his help-mate; and consequently may convert her into an article of merchandise. For the commandment says—"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife," as well as, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's man-servant nor maid-servant."

If I understand the Dr.'s argument, it is this, "Whatever is a man's by virtue of any relation whatsoever, is *his* in the sense of *property*, absolute property, that which may be bought and sold or used in any way according to the owner's good pleasure." But his wife is *his*, and therefore his property, to be bought, to be sold, to be disposed of as any other article of merchantable property! The sophistry of the Dr.'s argument consists in this, that he makes no distinction between the different relations in virtue of which persons and things are *his*. Thus he makes his *wife* and his house and his *man-servant* and his *maid-servant* and his *ox* and his *ass* to be his by the same relation. And, therefore, as he has the right of property in his house, his ox, and his ass, to buy and to sell, so he concludes he has the same right of property in his man-servant and maid-servant, yea in his wife, to buy and to sell, for they also are *his*. He seems to think that whatever

may be *coveted* is disposable *property*; hence as his wife may be coveted, according to his own argument, she is disposable property, as much so as his ox or his ass, or any thing that is *his*. Now Quere? Has not the Dr. in his zeal to apologize for slavery, proved altogether too much, and therefore proved nothing, except that his argument is a mere "humbug"? P. M.

ART. X. *Miscellaneous Items.*

THE LAW SUIT.—Our readers being already aware that the law suit instituted by the New-school secession, against the Presbyterian Church, was ordered for trial before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, on the 26th of November, will no doubt be anxious to hear what progress may have been made in the case. For their information we would state that the court of Nisi Prius, Judge Sergeant presiding, met and was duly organized in Philadelphia, on Monday the 26th ult., at ten o'clock, A. M. On the docket being read, it was ascertained that the case was placed first on the list, as a commonwealth case, that is, as one in which the commonwealth is directly interested, and which by the rules of court takes precedence of all other cases, although of much older date. When it was announced, therefore, as "*Commonwealth versus Green*," Judge Sergeant inquired why it was so represented on the docket? The counsel of the New-school very briefly remarked, that they regarded it in this light, from its general scope and bearings, or something to that effect. Judge Sergeant immediately replied, that the commonwealth, strictly speaking, had nothing to do with it, and therefore that it was not entitled to precedence. The case was thus thrown to the end of the docket, and after the docket was called over, it appears that its proper order was No. 13, of the cases ready for trial. In both instances, when this case was called, the counsel on each side responded that they were ready for trial. In consequence of the decision of Judge Sergeant, which was no doubt correct, it has now become a matter of doubt whether this case can be reached during the present sessions of the court, which continue only for three weeks. The witnesses in this case still continue to attend the court on the morning of each day; and will continue to attend until the trial takes place, or they are dismissed on the ground that it must be deferred. Patience must have its perfect work. The final result will be announced to our readers as soon as it occurs. The counsel for the defendants, are John Sergeant, Joseph R. Ingersoll, and F. W. Hubbell, Esqrs., and for the plaintiffs, Josiah Randall, Wm. M. Meredith, and George Wood, Esqrs.

P. S. Since the above was in type, the Church case has been deferred, by mutual consent of counsel, until the next term of the Supreme Court, which is to be held in February next.—*Presbyterian*.

HIRING a MINISTER.—This is a phrase very commonly used in various sections of our country, particularly in relation to the temporary settlement of ministers. A congregation, we speak not of all, for there are many, many honorable exceptions, make up an insufficient subscription to *hire* a minister for six months or a year; and when a candidate is,

fixed on they promise him a certain allowance either in produce or money on condition that he does a certain amount of preaching, visits the sick, baptizes their children, and attends funerals. The whole affair is looked on in the light of an ordinary bargain, with which kindness and affection have very little to do. We have more than once been distressed with the heartlessness displayed in these bargains, and have been led to inquire, whether there could be any proper sense of the nature of the ministry among those whose views in securing it are so mercenary. Why did Christ institute a ministry? Was it not to show his love for the souls of men? Did he not give pastors and teachers for the instruction, edification, and consolation of self-ruined sinners? And when these his chosen messengers come with his commission to impart spiritual gifts to the necessitous, they should not be regarded as hirelings and common laborers. If the character of their office was justly appreciated; if the love of the Master in sending them was considered; if the gracious and benevolent errand on which they come was regarded; they would be received cheerfully; their visit would be hailed with joy, and each one would be anxious, from a sense of gratitude to them and of love to their Lord, to do every thing in their power to minister to their comfort. We would hear nothing of the terms of a close bargain in which the services of the ministry were to be weighed against dollars and cents, but the Minister would be made comfortable in his worldly circumstances, not in payment of his services, for these when faithfully rendered, are beyond all earthly price, but as an evidence of their love to the Gospel, and of their gratitude in enjoying its stated ministrations. We apprehend that when vital piety is more prevalent, and the infinite importance of religion is generally felt it will not be regarded as a hard duty, but as a delightful privilege, to comfort and cherish the ministers of Christ. The sensibilities of God's servants will not be grated by the phraseology of the market, and they will not be left to suffer, as they now, in too many instances do, from the reluctant payment of stinted salaries. We sometimes fear that we do not even see the dawn of these better days.—*Presbyterian.*

THANKSGIVING.—On the day of the date of this paper, Nov. 29, 1838, the religious people of at least seven states will be engaged, at the summons of their respective Governors, in rendering public thanksgiving to Almighty God for the numerous mercies of the year, and in praying for the continuance of our blessings. Some of the proclamations refer very distinctly to the cause of freedom.—*Emancipator.*

Governor Kent, of Maine, says:

"As we assemble around the table of God's bounty, on this our annual festival, and remember in gratitude and with thanksgiving, his mercies to us as a people, and as individuals in our social and domestic relations, let us remember, in kindness and sympathy, the poor, the oppressed and destitute; let us cherish those kind and benevolent affections, which shall lead us to smooth the rough paths of life, regarding each other in the spirit of charity, as brethren of one common Father and bound together by the indissoluble ties of a common nature and a common destiny."

Governor Jennison, of Vermont, says:

"And finally, let us pray that the mild and benign influence of the religion of our LORD and SAVIOUR, Jesus Christ, may be extended and diffused, till all vice and immorality shall be exterminated; till the

blessed practice of doing to others as we would that others should do unto us, shall be universally established among men:—then will have been heard the last groan of the oppressed; then will man have ceased to claim property in his fellow-man, and true peace and good will be found co-extensive with the whole earth; then shall go up from every land one great voice, exclaiming—'Blessed is the nation whose GOD is the LORD: and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance.'"

Governor Ellsworth, of Connecticut, says:

"Let us supplicate God to preserve our political and social institutions and bind in closer friendship the States of the Union:—that he would shed light in the paths of our rulers, and direct to the adoption of wise and patriotic measures;—that he would restore harmony and kindness; impart the love of truth, justice and religion; prosper our colleges and schools, and every effort to diffuse light and knowledge; give success to our efforts in behalf of the ignorant, the poor and the suffering; extend our commerce, and manufactures and agriculture; put a stop to intemperance, bondage oppression and crime; and finally awaken us to a just apprehension of the responsibilities of living at the present era, and of the scenes so soon to open upon us in eternity."

BETTING ON ELECTIONS.—We have seen it stated, and we cannot doubt that the estimate is in the round correct, that more than half a million of dollars were staked upon the result of the Gubernatorial question in Pennsylvania! A more wicked, infamous tampering with the doctrines of morality and good sense cannot be shown on the page of the history of our State. Such indirect bribes must tend to remove the discussion of men's fitness for office from an examination of their principles and fitness to the avaricious desires of the voter: and as the amount periled increases, so in proportion advances the determination of the gamester to leave no means untried to insure the success of the cause which so deeply involves his own pecuniary interest. He closes his own mind against any false doctrines that time may develope in the conduct of his candidate, and goes to the polls, not to deposite the vote of a freemen, but to add to the probability of his securing the spoils of the moneyed speculation. We hold it to be a rule sustained by sound logic that the man who bets on the result of an election, surrenders the dearest principle of freedom,—the moral qualities of an elector. He has sold his opinion for money, and is no more to be trusted with the privileges of a citizen, than is the card shuffler to be entrusted with the possession of his neighbor's uncounted purse. The lenient may grade gaming as tipplers classify intemperance, and throw a different coloring over the conduct of the political gamester than that which they award to the frequenter of the billiard-table, the faro-bank, or the card-hell; but in the eye of strict morality there is no difference, and the citizen who brawls out his political preferences and backs them by a bet on their success, is steeped in as much infamy as covers the degraded professional black-leg, with his loaded dice and spotted cards.—*Pittsburgh Sat. Eve. Visitor.*

MEDICAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—Such is the title of a Society recently established in China. The object of it, as set forth in a pamphlet transmitted to us by the Corresponding Secretary, is to spread the benefits of a rational medicine and surgery among the Chinese, by

means of medical gentlemen who shall practice gratuitously under the patronage of the society. The *Medical Missionary* must be able to furnish full testimonials of thorough education in his profession, as well as of his piety, prudence, and correct moral and religious character. The object is truly benevolent. The Chinese are almost totally ignorant of medicine and surgery; and yet they are subject to disease in its worst and most malignant forms. Their sufferings, therefore, are almost inconceivable. If the Author of Christianity thought it not inconsistent with his divine mission to *heal the sick*, and if, wherever his religion has prevailed, *Infirmaries and Hospitals* have been reared in obedience to its humane spirit, this project should not be regarded by Christians as one which has few claims to their attention. Besides, it is well known, that the Chinese are more inaccessible to foreigners than any other nation: to penetrate into the interior of their empire is almost an impossibility; and those who visit them with the sole object of instructing them in the Christian religion find insurmountable difficulties in their way; but all their restrictions and prejudices seem to give way, when the skillful physician tenders his services to mitigate their bodily diseases. Pious physicians, and such alone this Society proposes to employ, besides the direct benefit which they may impart to suffering humanity may also prove effective pioneers to the heralds of the cross; nay, they, themselves may enjoy many favorable opportunities of holding up to the attention of this singular and interesting people, the cheering truths of the Gospel. Great liberality has already been displayed by influential foreigners, resident in Canton, in behalf of this institution, and not only has an *Ophthalmic Hospital* already been prepared, but arrangements are in train for departments for the treatment of other prevalent diseases. Co-operation from the United States is needed and expected, not only in the way of pecuniary contributions, but in medical men of the right qualifications.—*Presbyterian*.

ON PRIVATE PRAYER.—Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy chamber, and shut the door. And the reason is plain. He who would pray, must first retire; the spirit of the world and the spirit of prayer are contrary the one from the other, and experience will teach any one that he cannot well pray in a crowd. Business, or pleasure, or even common conversation, if it be about the things of this world, and continue for any long time, will strangely indispose the mind for devotion; and the soul, before she can take her flight to heaven, must plume and balance her wings by holy meditation: she must rally her scattered and dissipated thoughts, and fix them on the business she is going about: she must consider the nature of God, to whom she is to pray; of herself, who is to pray to him; and of those things for which she is to pray; she must know the sins she has been guilty of, to confess them and the graces she stands in need of, to petition for them. All this is not to be done but by deep meditation, which is the mother of devotion, is the daughter of retirement. They who do not meditate can not pray; and they who do not retire, can do neither.—*Bishop Horne*.

MALTA—*Conversion of Roman Catholics*.—The Journal of Commerce gives the following letter from a member of the Wesleyan Mission in that Island to his friend in this city:

Valetta, Sept. 18, 1838.

In Malta all goes on much as usual, but the partial liberty which has

been given to printing lately, has excited in many a great desire for reading. At present there are not less than five periodicals published by the three Maltese presses now established in Valetta. The censorship still continues, but it is by no means strict, and we hope ere long that it will be removed altogether. I presume you heard of the Popish Missionary to Tunis, who came to Malta about eight months ago and has joined our church. The thing caused a great disturbance in the town; three times was poor Signor Menna brought before the tribunal of Justice, and we had enough to do with the aid of the Police to preserve him from the *barbarous* mob. He is a Neapolitan, and for the present is connected with our Mission in the capacity of a translator from the Latin into the Italian, &c. His life has been very consistent, and I trust he will be made an instrument in the hands of God of doing much good. He is at present carrying on a correspondence with Canonico Pasila in regard to some doctrinal points of dispute between Protestants and Papists. To day a Dominican Missionary from Constantinople has taken pratique, and I have just had a conversation with him: to-morrow he intends to follow the example of Signor Menna and throw off his dress. We may expect a dreadful row, but may the Lord protect us and this poor man from the fury of these ignorant people.

THE INFIDEL'S DEATH BED.—Added to the many proofs of the folly of infidelity and of its incapability to sustain its advocate on his death-bed, is the following renunciation of this fatal delusion, by Micajah Woods, Esq., who died in the county of Albermarle, Va., on the 23d of March, in the 61st year of his age. We may cherish the belief that there is no God, while in health and strength, and while the hour of death is, in our apprehension, far distant; but when the grim messenger of death stares us in the face, when a guilty and awakened conscience sets our sins in array against us, it is then we shall feel and know there is a God.

The sketch is given by a minister of the Gospel through the columns of the Charlottesville Herald.

Mr. W., from his first settlement in life, had been industriously and successfully engaged in agricultural pursuits, and had in this way amassed an ample fortune. He possessed a vigorous and discriminating mind a kind and benevolent heart. Few men have enjoyed a larger share of the confidence and love of their associates and acquaintances. He had long and ably filled several of the most respectable offices—and at the period of his death, was the high sheriff of this county.

Ten days before his death, I was called to visit him. No apprehension was at that time felt of a speedy dissolution. He had no fever, and his mind was usually clear and vigorous.

When I entered his sick room, a scene of moral sublimity was presented which I can never forget. A venerable old black man—one of his own slaves—stood at his bed side grasping his master's hand, and pointing him to the Saviour. "There, Sir," said the sick man, "You see a faithful old servant who has answered the end of his being far better than I have—he is a Christian, I am a lost sinner, I would rather now be what he is, than what I am, though I possessed the wealth of the East Indies.—I have been a wretched disciple of Paine; and what is worse, I have endeavoured to make others as bad as myself. Will

you pray for me?" With this affecting request I complied, surrounded by his weeping family and friends.

During the afternoon and evening, he made many such remarks as the following; "What have I gained by all the deistical works of which I was once so fond? Nothing but the horror and distress of mind which I now suffer—they are the cause of my misery—now they seem to me as the poison of the serpent. I despise—I renounce them all." On the next morning he said, "when I am cold in the dust, tell the people from the pulpit all I have said to you—give them a full history of my case—tell them I have made full proof of infidelity—and that I found it when I came to die, as a basket without a bottom. It may do in life—but it will not do in death."

Two of his old friends and associates called to see him, who, he supposed, still entertained the sentiments he had just renounced. He was much affected at seeing them—addressing himself to them, he said, 'I hope you will not be displeased; we once held the same opinions—I hold them no longer, I renounce that creed, I cannot die an infidel: I beg you to renounce it also. He continued to speak to them with great penitency and force. When they left the room, he asked me if he had done wrong, if he had said any thing amiss, adding, 'I could not let so good an opportunity pass of trying to do them good. I pray they may never regret it.'

The open and unqualified renunciation of infidelity, was accompanied by symptoms of unaffected repentance. He was not overwhelmed with fear; indeed he very seldom alluded to the consequences of sin, but seemed to be wholly engrossed with its intrinsic vileness. A very common expression of his was, 'all that I can say is, God have mercy upon me, a poor, mean, vile sinner.' At another time he spoke substantially as follows: "I am aware that my acquaintances have also considered me a very upright moral man; a good citizen; and they love me a good deal more than I deserve. But had they known what a heart I had they would have thought very differently. With all my outward morality, I have been at heart a vile sinner." Smiting on his breast, he exclaimed 'here have rested thousands of sins which no eye has seen but that of God.'—*Middlebury Free Press*.

RELIGION OF THE HEART ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESS.—Religion is poor business, unless the heart be in it. My son, give me thine heart. If this be not given, nothing else will be given, unless reluctantly, and therefore unacceptably. But every thing will follow the heart; and where there is first a willing mind, and concern to please, imperfections in the manner will be overlooked in the motive; and if the deed be hindered, it will be accepted according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not. Yet there is much in the proverb, "Where there is a will, there is a way." Nothing often is wanting, as to efficiency, but resolution; and a fulness of resolution is most likely to arise from a fulness of inclination. Love gives ardour and boldness—love is strong as death; many waters cannot quench love, nor floods drown it. While the slothful sees thorns, and the coward cries, "there is a lion in the way—I shall be slain in the streets," purpose of heart, founded not in our own strength, but in the strength of the Lord, (and in a christian it is always so founded,) clears away difficulties, or is roused by them into greater vigor and strenuousness.

n-
s
h
I
e
n
e
y
d
n

-
s
I
I
t
o
y

I
a
e

1
1

CONTENTS.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
ART. I. Historical sketch of the United Brethren or Moravians. Continued from page 304.....	337	ART. VII. Poetry—Adrian.....	375
ART. II. Slavery essentially immoral. Continued from page 345.....	343	ART. VIII. Excommunication of the Surghaya.—A mistake corrected.....	377
ART. III. An examination of the decision of the Associate Synod of 1838, respecting the two parties claiming to be the Presbytery of Albany.....	350	ART. IX. A Pro-Slavery Argument considered.....	378
ART. IV. Family Government. Continued from page 330.....	361	ART. X. Miscellaneous Items.....	379
ART. V. Precious Remedies against Satan's Devices. Continued from page 379.....	385	The Law Suit—Hiring a Minister.....	379
ART. VI. Eight reasons against Universalism.....		Thanksgiving.....	380
		Betting on Elections.—Medical Missionary Society.....	381
		On Private Prayer—Malta.....	382
		The Infidel's Death Bed.....	383
		Religion of the Heart essential to success.....	384

New subscribers can be furnished with the present (the XV) volume from the beginning.

Persons wishing the XIV volume can be supplied with the same at half price.

Those subscribers who are in debt for the XIV, or any previous volume, are requested to make payment with all convenient speed. Letters enclosing \$5.00 or more, may be sent at our expense and risk.

JAMES MARTIN.

Receipts during the month of December by Mail.

George Kerr,.....\$23 40 | Rev. James Wallace,.....\$5 00

☞ All persons having in their possession the names of subscribers to the **DISCOURSES AND BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES**, proposed to be published by Rev. J. P. Miller, will please forward them immediately either to him or the Rev. J. Martin.

CONFSSION OF FAITH: the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, with the scriptural proofs at large, new edition, just published by order of the Synod of the Associate Church of North America. For sale by

JAMES HENRY, 71 State-street, Albany.

AGENTS.

In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of the Associate Church, who are authorized to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as special agents:

Peter McArthur, Cambridge, Washington Co., N. Y.

A. Bishop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y.

Allen Gaffey, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co., Pa.

Wm. McMillan, Potter's Mills, Dutchess Co., Pa.

Andrew Graham, Baltimore, Md.

Andrew Murco, Canonsburgh, Pa.

Rev. Samuel Wilson, Xenia, Ohio.

James Gordon, Poole's, Livingston Co. N. Y.

Rev. James Rogers, Pithersburg, Pa.

Thos's Cummings, Putnam, Wash'n Co. N. Y.

James Wilson, Esq., Pater's Grove, York Co. Pa.

Alexander W. Brewster, Erie, Pa.

James Hightsham, Esq., New London Green Roads, Chester Co. Pa.

John Smith, P. M., Pleasant Run, Carroll Co., Indiana.

John Anderson, Haptingdon, Pa.

William B. Young, 173 Race-street, Philadelphia.

R. G. Shannon, P. M., Columbus, Run. Co., Ill.

The **Religious Monitor** is published monthly, at \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance.